



the African Communist

No 20

Jan./Mar.

1965

THE BATTLE FOR THE CONGO

BA 320.53205

AFR

S.83/104

RECEIVED BY

993 -10- 12

PRICE

South Africa and High Commission Territories: 10 cents. Elsewhere in Africa: 1s. All other countries, 1s. 6d., or equivalent in local currency

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION (4 ISSUES)

*Africa, 40 cents (or 4s.) post free.
All other countries, 6s. (U.S. \$1) or
equivalent.
Airmail, 15s. (U.S., \$2.50)*

AGENTS

*Usual trade discount (one-third of
retail price) to bookshops and
sellers ordering 12 or more copies*

EDITORIAL

*Articles, letters, material for articles
and comment are invited on all themes
of African interest, but payment is
by prior arrangement only*

ADDRESS

*All letters, subscriptions and other
correspondence must be sent to
the distributor:*

**Ellis Bowles, 52 Palmerston Road,
London, S.W.14, England**

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

*Published quarterly in the interests of
African solidarity, and as a forum for
Marxist-Leninist thought throughout
our Continent, by the
South African Communist Party*

No 20 January-March 1965

Contents

3 EDITORIAL NOTES

THE FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM

13 A POEM OF VENGEANCE

Kumalo of the ANC

15 SOUTH AFRICAN FREEDOM SONGS

A TRIBUTE TO THE PATRIOT VUYISILE MINI

18 FROM THE DEATH CELL

19 THE BATTLE FOR THE CONGO

A. Lerumo

32 NO MERCY FROM VORSTER

Z. Nkosi

43 'CHEATED NOT DEFEATED'

BACKGROUND TO BRITISH GUIANA ELECTIONS

George David

54 HOW VERWOERD USES ANTI- COMMUNISM

Savitri Azad


65 ALL OVER AFRICA

NOTES ON CURRENT EVENTS

71 BOOK REVIEWS

THE ECONOMICS OF APARTHEID

J. J. Jabulani



THE FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM

ALL THROUGH AFRICA the battle lines run. Now on one front, now another, they erupt into action, hitting world headlines. Tshombe's hired assassins, with the backing of regular United States and Belgian troops, recapture Stanleyville—and for a while the world is reminded of the bitter warfare that will never cease smouldering and flaring up in the Congo until Lumumba's vision of independence is realized and his murderers brought to justice. In 'Portuguese' Guinea, Angola, Mozambique, Salazar's army of occupation continue their merciless slaughter of patriots and of terror against villagers, men, women and children—only rarely does the outside world get a glimpse of this unceasing terror, as when a story comes out of the desperate plight of homeless families who have fled for their lives into neighbouring Tanzania.

In the far South, there are no frontiers—or rather, the frontier is everywhere. Nkomo is captive in Smith's concentration camp; Mandela on bleak Robben Island the symbol of thousands jailed by Verwoerd and Vorster for claiming their birthright of a free South Africa. And still the cramming of the jails goes on, as 'trials' of patriots and demo-

crats continue to be staged in Johannesburg, Durban, Cape Town and many other centres. Mkwai, Maharaj, Kitson, Matthews, and Chiba all of whom had already received long sentences for sabotage at the time of writing these notes; Abram Fischer and thirteen others who are being charged with being members of the Communist Party and taking part in its activities; M. P. Naicker and others, upon similar charges in Durban. . . . All these and scores of other current and pending proceedings bear witness to the fact that seventeen years after the post-war election victory of the Afrikaner Nationalist Party and fifteen years after the passing of the Suppression of Communism Act, designed to eradicate 'communism' and all forms of militant opposition to apartheid, the fires of resistance in South Africa are burning brighter than ever. Following the race-obsessed psychopath Verwoerd, and with the acquiescence and tacit support of the great majority of the white population, the ruling circles have set themselves the impossible task of maintaining the extreme South of the continent as a preserve of rabid racialism, African enslavement and white mastery, a refuge and last-ditch stronghold of the forces of colonialism that have been and are being thrust back and overcome, country by country and area by area from the Mediterranean to the Zambesi River. They have set themselves to trample out the veld-fire of resistance in South Africa itself. And, it is true, that—as in every other country where the forces of oppression have thrown overboard all civil liberties, all rule of law—they have had their empty 'victories'.

Thousands of great-hearted resistance leaders have been subjected to the most barbarous tortures. The special branch studied and made use of the techniques of the Gestapo, the O.A.S. and the Portuguese PIDE how to break down human beings not only in body and in mind but also in spirit. With a few, they succeeded. But it is not those few whom history will remember, the Mtolos, Beylevelds, Leftwiches or Mtembus. It is the thousands whom no torture could break; the men like 'Babla' Saloojee and 'Looksmart' Ngudle, who took their own lives rather than betray their comrades; like Morris Matsomelo who refused to testify in Court against leaders of Umkonto we Sizwe and was himself jailed for his loyalty; like Vuyisile Mini who died as he had lived, a true son of Africa, filled with contempt for the murderers of African freedom and confidence in ultimate victory.

Yes, the special branch did break a few people, who from now till their dying day will live with the sour taste of treachery in their mouths, and look no man in the eye. They were able to find a spy like Ludi, the consummate liar who succeeded for a while in passing himself off as a genuine opponent of apartheid and came to Court to boast of his

exploits as a seducer. As a result, many whose 'crime' was to defy the innumerable laws against freedom of speech and organization have gone through the solemn farce of a 'legal trial'. They have been condemned to prolonged terms of imprisonment—many, like the men of Rivonia and Wilton Mkwayi, to lifetime sentences. Today, so far from being accorded the dignity customarily accorded to political prisoners, they are jailed under the worst conditions permitted under the (atrocious, at their best) South African prison regulations: graded as 'Category D', usually reserved for the most hardened and habitual common criminals.

With the 'laws' he has at his disposal, a negation of every concept of a law-governed society, Vorster does not however need Court convictions to preclude his opponents from political activity, or to wreak his implacable vengeance against consistent democrats and anti-fascists, no matter how long ago it was that they stood up to be counted, or how careful they have been not to infringe his government's legislation since. What does it matter whether a Court imposes a lifetime sentence or five years—when, as the Sobukwe case shows, Vorster has, and uses powers to keep political prisoners in jail long years after their sentences have expired? Court trials are a farce because, without any trial, without any charge, without any opportunity for a hearing, men and women are arbitrarily victimized all over South Africa at the whim of the Minister, acting on the advice and information of the proved liars of his special branch. The 'ninety-day, no trial' clause has been suspended—how little this means is well analyzed in Z. Nkosi's article on this subject in this issue—but all over the country men and women are still under house-arrest, or in enforced exile, or forbidden to leave the areas where they live, to attend meetings, to write or prepare material for publication—and a score of other medieval persecutions devised by the sadistic mind of this fanatical Nazi.

Everyone with a past record of radical opposition to apartheid theories and practices, even if he were a Communist twenty years ago when the Party was legal, is hedged around with a barbed-wire fence of bans, surveillance and prohibitions which make it impossible for him not only to exercise citizenship rights, but even to make a living and carry on a normal life. Men like Dr. Eddie Roux and Professor Jack Simons are summarily ordered out of senior teaching posts at universities. All 'listed' lawyers will soon be barred from the practice of their profession—thinning still further the already sadly depleted ranks of legal men who have the courage to defend political cases—and this at a time when the number of such cases threatens to break all records.

A NEW PHASE

What in practice has the neo-Nazi 'National Party' achieved after seventeen years? They have piled up a mountain of apartheid legislation to make the indigenous majority of inhabitants statutory 'foreigners' in their motherland and to deprive them of even the token representation and the other few grudging acknowledgments of their fundamental humanity and citizenship which the highly illiberal regimes of Smuts and his predecessors had once been compelled to concede. They have piled up a second mountain of repressive legislation to quell the mass opposition which such drastic infringements of people's rights inevitably called forth. Beginning with Communism, they have made it illegal to advocate and propagate the entire body of humanitarian and progressive thought, of which Communism is a part, and which finds its broadest expression in the Charter of the United Nations. They have murdered some of the finest sons of our country—crimes for which in due course they will be sternly called to account—and filled the prisons with patriots. They have, in peace-time, militarized the country to an extent, and at an expense, far higher than ever before, even in time of war, and built up a vast machinery of police and army repression and aggression, full time and part time, in which white South Africans are being indoctrinated, trained and prepared to fulfil their appointed role, as Verwoerd sees it, of coppers' narks, and last-ditch defenders of alien rule in Africa from Cape to Cairo.

Now Vorster looks proudly round South Africa at his handiwork, and boasts that all resistance has been smashed and subdued. 'We are within sight of the end of organized internal sabotage and subversion,' he said. He imagines that because he has, with methods of brute force, silenced, in one way or another, all those who in the past spoke up publicly against the swinishness of his government, he has thereby extinguished opposition and resistance altogether. It is not the first time the spokesmen of the Broederbond Republic have announced 'the end of subversion and Communism', only within a few months to demand and receive still more drastic powers to 'deal with' the 'menace' already supposedly ended. This boastful Nazi is wrong again. Neither fascist legislation nor fascist terror-tactics can destroy resistance and struggle for democracy in South Africa, for freedom is as necessary to our people as the very air they breathe.

It was in 1950 that the government outlawed the Communist Party, yet in 1965, all over the country men and women are facing trial accused of belonging to the Communist Party. The African National Congress has been unlawful since 1960 and yet the courts are filled with cases of men and women accused of A.N.C. membership. Most of

these trials are unreported and unknown to the public, in South Africa as well as abroad. For example, in two months (September 9th to November 11th, 1964) no less than 231 people were convicted for A.N.C. membership in the two small Eastern Cape Province towns of Somerset East and Graaff Reinet.

The price for such 'victories' of Vorster and his Gestapo is fearful. The special branch army of spies and sneaks has proliferated in the country like a cancerous growth. The S.A.B.C. radio service has become a gramophone for propaganda directed by the Broederbond (Verwoerd's secret fascist movement that dominates South Africa). Censorship of all kinds is being tightened up. Hated by the masses of the people at home, treated with ever-increasing contempt and isolation in the outside world, the white supremacy regime knows no answer but to tighten up repression still more, to accompany martial law with yet further militarization of the state and the economy. All this is done, and consented to by the white minority, in the name of preserving white privileges and of 'security'. Yet there is no security. Behind locked doors and barred windows, afraid to venture alone into the streets at night, wives and children practising how to kill with pistols, the whites of South Africa are living in a state of constant tension. Never have fear and insecurity stalked the land to the extent that they do today.

And all, in the end, to no purpose. Vorster's terror can no more destroy the Communist Party, the African National Congress and the alliance for the Freedom Charter, than the similar methods of his predecessors in other countries could succeed in the past in similar objects. At the height of the Nazi occupation of France, the slogan appeared on the walls in many French cities *You can kill Communists but you cannot kill Communism!* Hitler and Mussolini, the much-admired heroes of Verwoerd, built up the most efficient, expensive and ruthless machine ever known to 'destroy Communism'. The first died like a dog in a cellar in Berlin, the second was hung up by his feet, like a dead pig. The Marxist and democratic parties whose members they murdered and persecuted survived to form people's governments in the German Democratic Republic and the occupied countries of Eastern Europe; in France and Italy the Communists have the largest parties. Despite Franco and Salazar terror, the Communist parties in Spain and Portugal are very much alive and the leading force of the democratic opposition, as frequent current reports of new prosecutions and persecutions testify. If we look at the current experience of national liberation movements under colonialist persecution, the lesson is the same. Names of men like Nehru and Nkrumah, who emerged from

jail to head popular governments, symbolize the truth that the persecution of their leaders can never stop the onward march of a people determined to win freedom. Vorster can persecute Mandela, Sisulu, Kathrada, Fischer, but let him not deceive himself that he has thereby quelled resistance to apartheid.

In the last analysis the whole oppressed and democratic people is the enemy of apartheid. You cannot jail such an 'enemy' without bringing to a stop the entire economy, with none to dig gold and diamonds, labour in farms and factories, construct buildings and roads.

The frontiers of the freedom struggle are everywhere in South Africa; they run through every factory and mine compound, every city and township, every reserve. The freedom-soldiers wear no uniform; they are part of and merged with the toiling masses. They fight on every battlefield in every way; their weapons are truth against lies, vigilance and discipline against repression and spies, retaliation against force. And for every patriot and democrat captured or betrayed to the enemy, a dozen, a hundred, a thousand will come forward from the inexhaustible ranks of the people. This is not a conspiracy to be destroyed by the discovery and imprisonment of a few leaders and spokesmen, no matter how great and talented; it is a great upsurge of the people for freedom that can never be stopped until it has attained its goal.

ALL OVER THE WORLD

South Africa is and will remain the crucial battlefield; but our frontiers run far beyond the borders of our country. Our fight for a free South Africa is inextricably linked with the movement of all the peoples of Africa against colonialism, neo-colonialism and foreign domination. It is a part of the struggle of all mankind against imperialist war and aggression, against oppression and exploitation everywhere. We who fight apartheid in South Africa are side by side with the brave guerillas of the Revolutionary Government of the Congo: they are fighting our battle against white domination in South Africa, and we are fighting their battle as well as our own. We are with the soldier-peasants of South Viet Nam fighting back against gross aggression and savage terrorism by the United States and its puppets in Saigon. We are with the peoples of the socialist lands who work to strengthen their economies and their defences against imperialist aggression, and to help defend the independence of the newly-liberated victims of colonialism everywhere. We are with our allies, the communist and labour movements in the developed capitalist countries. And they are with us. This is the people's international.

Verwoerd and his fascist regime do not stand alone either. Backing

them—and sharing in the bloody profits of apartheid—is a very different ‘international’—imperialist finance-capital, whose only standard of morality is profit, regardless of the cost in human dignity and suffering, in starvation and blood. For such profits, United States and Belgian paratroopers flew from the British base of Ascension to shoot Congolese patriots; American planes rain death and destruction on Viet Nam villages; British troops fight in the Malayan jungles.

It is the same unholy crew—or an important section of them—who stand behind and hold up the Verwoerd regime in South Africa. Their strength and influence is such that they can defy public opinion, solidly ranged against apartheid throughout the world, and overrule governments whose views and national interests are equally opposed to apartheid.

In a foreword to the important pamphlet *The Collaborators*, published last year by the Anti-Apartheid Movement in London, Mrs. Barbara Castle welcomed it ‘because it compels us to face the truth that British firms and British people are profiting from apartheid’. The pamphlet shows that Britain is the heaviest investor in South Africa—the total of over £1,000 million of British money in the Republic exceeds the total invested in the rest of Africa. Britain takes a third of South Africa’s total exports, excluding gold. Some 333 British companies have South African associates or subsidiaries—many are listed in the pamphlet. The Labour Government has pledged that (though it has licensed the export of Buccaneer aircraft contracted for under the Tory government) it will supply no further armaments to South Africa. This action was bitterly resisted by the powerful ‘South Africa Lobby’ in the City of London, with their vast South African holdings, and spreading its tentacles into both Houses of Parliament and big sections of the newspaper press.

There can be no doubt that such opposition is one of the reasons why the Labour Government has thus far taken no steps to ‘examine the issue of economic sanctions seriously and urgently, as the United Nations General Assembly has urged us to do’ as proposed by Mrs. Castle, now Minister for Overseas Development in the British Cabinet, and like Mr. Wilson and other Ministers, a member of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. How can one explain that, despite vigorous condemnation of the disgraceful Tory policies on such questions as apartheid, the High Commission territories in South Africa, and many others, the Labour Government has in all main respects been content to continue such policies? In opposition, Mr. Wilson condemned Duncan Sandys’ shabby manoeuvre to oust the Jagan government as ‘a fiddled constitution’—but refused to heed urgent representations to halt the cheating elections under this constitution. Nor can any African

forget Britain's collaboration in the U.S.-Belgian aggression in the Congo. (Both themes are dealt with in articles in the current issue.)

The answer to such questions cannot be dealt with in terms of such oversimplifications as that the Labour leaders are hypocritical, or that they have changed their opinions since assuming office. Once having undertaken to maintain capitalism, in accordance with the thoroughly muddled and bourgeois political and economic ideas of British Social Democracy, the Labour Party finds itself subjected to overwhelming pressure from the powerful financial and capitalist interests which dominate the economy; pressure which could only be resisted by mobilizing the organized strength of the entire Labour movement for the implementation of progressive policies to which the Party is pledged.

Of critical importance, in this connection, will be the future of British policy towards apartheid and Southern Africa. On no question have the Labour leaders and the Trade Union Congress, responding to overwhelming membership opinion, pledged themselves more clearly and specifically. Nor is this only a matter of the feelings of labour people and other humanitarians, against a vile, racialistic police state. National interests are involved, of far greater weight than those of the relatively small, if excessively noisy, section in Britain which reaps rich dividends from sweated African labour in the Rand mines. Britain's international standing has been seriously damaged in the past, especially among the non-aligned states of Africa and Asia, by the revolting hypocrisy of her Southern Africa policy. Should this policy continue, in the coming period of increased urgency of this grave all-African and world problem, it can hardly be doubted that the boycott of South African goods will be extended to those who arm, invest in, have defence and diplomatic agreements with, and trade with the aggressive apartheid Republic.

Other leading *collaborators* with apartheid, and saboteurs of the United Nations General Assembly resolution on the severance of trade and diplomatic relations with the Broederbond Republic, are the United States, France, West Germany and Japan. All these countries, no doubt, value their profitable trade and other relations with the independent states of Africa and Asia. The time is coming closer when they will all be forced to choose between this trade and the odious traffic with apartheid which they are at present continuing and striving to increase.

It is particularly distasteful to find among this company an Asian country, Japan. According to Japanese government statistics, trade with South Africa rose by about one third in 1964. In the nine months from January to September Japan bought R82,860,000 worth of South

African goods (over £40 million—2 rands (R) = £1 sterling). Japanese dockers refused to handle South African goods designed for exhibition at the Osaka International Trade Fair, but means were found nevertheless to display such goods, and participation on a yet bigger scale is planned at the Tokyo Fair in April.

It is true that through this large trade the Japanese government has succeeded in purchasing an exemption for Japanese citizens from the apartheid definition of 'non-white'. Japanese commercial delegations are thereby entitled to stay at South African hotels reserved for whites and—if they care to risk the inevitable gross insults which are sure to come their way—participate in other privileges normally set aside for the exclusive use of those of 'European descent'. Against this doubtful 'honour' must be set the very real national humiliation which the Japanese ruling classes, in their fanatical search for profits, are inflicting on their people as a whole by seeking and obtaining this 'exemption' so profoundly wounding to national dignity. Moreover, by thus sabotaging the Afro-Asian campaign to boycott the apartheid state, the Japanese authorities are deliberately cutting themselves away from the Asian community and the Afro-Asian community. Accustomed as they are to humiliating themselves before arrogant United States imperialism, national honour may be something of small value to the millionaire monopolies which rule Japan today. But they have to reckon with the outraged indignation of the Japanese masses, and also with the wreck of their hopes to expand friendly trading and other relations with the countries of Africa and Asia. The Japanese Anti-Apartheid Movement and other progressive and democratic forces have a most serious international obligation which is also a patriotic duty to bring these facts forcefully before the public in their country. And the African and Asian countries—the great majority of whom are making real sacrifices in their sincere support of South African freedom—should make it very clear to Japan's ruling circles that in continuing this disgraceful traffic with South Africa they are playing with fire and risking very costly losses.

What we have said of Britain and Japan applies in like terms to all the capitalist countries whose trade and aid sustains the monstrous Verwoerd regime in Africa. Everywhere the interests of the great majority of the people, expressed with greater or lesser degrees of clarity and militancy by the labour and democratic movement, are opposed to apartheid, and in favour of the policy upheld by the African, Asian and Socialist countries of sanctions, boycott and isolation of South Africa while white domination lasts. And everywhere these interests are opposed by powerful minority groups with a stake in maintaining apartheid.

These minorities are powerful because of their intimate links with international financial institutions and with sections of the ruling economic and political establishment in each capitalist country. And they are organized internationally and backed by the South African embassies in every capitalist country, massively financed, with numerous specialized departments to issue and place propaganda material whitewashing apartheid, to attract investment and trade, to reinforce the inflow of white emigrants. They are backed also by the powerful 'South Africa Foundation' which unites all the big capitalist firms in the country, irrespective of their party affiliations, in an attempt to 'sell' apartheid abroad, and includes Harry Oppenheimer's vast Anglo-American Corporation which, with De Beer's Consolidated Mines, spreads its tentacles all over Africa. In Britain the 'South Africa Lobby' also enjoys widespread organized support ranging from the National Association of Manufacturers to the 'League of Empire Loyalists' and crudely fascist outfits.

Against these purposeful, well-organized and massively-financed forces, the forces opposing apartheid and supporting the concept of a free South Africa, though they do in fact comprise the overwhelming majority of mankind, are insufficiently coherent, lacking the clarity and unity of purpose and effectiveness of executive action, to realize their tremendous potential superiority. One of the major tasks of the innumerable supporters of the heroic South African liberation movement throughout the world during 1965, therefore, will be to overcome these weaknesses, and to translate the passionate indignation and protest of freedom-loving humanity against the horrors of apartheid into effective action to help its victims to free themselves.

Today, more clearly than ever before, we must realize that the epic South African struggle is a world issue. The crucial battles, as always, will be fought in the cities, villages and rural areas of South Africa itself; but the frontiers and the battle-lines run throughout the world, wherever men and women value freedom and human dignity.

A POEM OF VENGEANCE

Kumalo
of the ANC

This poem and the accompanying lino-cut—a tribute by an American artist—are reprinted from *Spotlight on South Africa*, published by the ANC of S.A., in Dar Es Salaam.



Naylor 1964

*Mini,
Big strong smiling Mini
and Khayinga and Mkaba who loved life
no less, have been robbed
of their most precious possession,
life.*

*Our comrades fell
in Verwoerd's Pretoria
bitten in the neck
by the hangman's knot.*

*Have you seen life slipping away?
I once saw my mother die
on the sharp sand at Sharpeville.*

*I hear Babla my brother cry
and his body hitting the concrete
one hundred feet down
from the interrogator's window.*

*Have you seen the face
of a man being beaten up?
In prison
when you hear the noise
your heart-beats race.*

*But worst of all
is the sigh
 or shriek
 or cough or
 —or nothing*

*just escaping air
as life slips away.
How did Mini and my brothers die*

*in that secret hanging place?
You may ask—please let me tell you—
I know.*

*Singing? Yes—but how they sing!
Big firm Mini
not smiling on this day
a smile at the lips perhaps
but the eyes grim
always grim
when facing the enemy.*

*Heads high they walk
strong united together
singing Mini's own song
'Naants' indod' emnyama Verwoerd'
—Watch out Verwoerd the black man
will get you—
'Watch out Verwoerd' . .
the people have taken up this song
'Watch out Verwoerd'
the world sings with Mini.*

*And meeting Death
in their front-line trench
the three heroes shout
into the grey teeth of the enemy
'We shall be avenged'
and the people take up the shout
'Our heroes shall be avenged.'*

*It is vengeance we want
as the last precious gasps
escape into the Pretoria air.*

SOUTH AFRICAN FREEDOM SONGS:

A Tribute to the Patriot Vuyisile Mini

AS DISTINGUISHED from staid and conservative choral compositions the term freedom song applies specially to a new phenomenon in South African life. This is the revolutionary song whose content and form not only express forcefully the mood and feelings of the South African freedom fighters but this is the song which unites black and white in the expression of their common aspiration for a free South Africa.

The freedom song is perhaps the most suitable vehicle for bridging the gap between the cultural and national characteristics of the different racial groups in South Africa. These songs are sung by the freedom fighters as they are composed without any translation into the different languages spoken. Thus in the process of struggle the fighters more often than not commune in the same language and know what it is all about.

Another feature of the freedom song is that it portrays the various stages reached by the people as they overcome obstacles on the march to freedom. The songs which were born in the 1950's when the era of

positive, militant and revolutionary action came into the forefront as the only correct method of resistance, these freedom songs expressed this fighting attitude of mind. When the Congress volunteers went to jail in 1952 in defiance against unjust laws they sang:

‘Imithetho ka Malani isiphethe nzima, Mayibuy’ i Afrika’

(Malan’s laws are a burden to us, come back Africa).

Later when Chief Lutuli became President of the A.N.C. the people sang:

‘Malan o tshohile
le ’muso oa hae
Lutuli phakisa onke’ muso’

(Malan has taken fright, make haste Lutuli and form a new government).

In 1956 the Federation of South African Women mobilized the biggest ever multi-racial protest demonstration of women in front of the Union Buildings. They were protesting against the threatened extension of pass laws to women, and they sang defiantly if not prophetically for the Premier Strydom soon died:

Hey Strydom,
Wathint’ a bafazi, way ithint’ imbokodo
uza kufa’

(Hey Strydom, now that you have touched the women, you have struck a rock, you have dislodged a boulder, and you will be crushed).

To hear the rich baritone of the late Vuyisile Mini when he led mass Congress meetings in song was always an inspiring event in itself. He was well known for his singing in every province of South Africa. Mini himself composed numerous freedom songs. Perhaps, this is one point of criticism that could be made against the movement, that these songs were not properly written and recorded but merely spontaneously sung when the words became known. They are not long songs. On the contrary they are short and repetitive, thus making it easy for all to learn the words. The mass solidarity of any Congress gathering builds up around these songs. The South African police sensed this unity and have never dared to arrest a leader whilst the singing was going on.

As a young man Mini sang in several choral groups such as the Port Elizabeth Male Voice Choir, Ikhwezi and a choir presently led by Enoch Gwashu of Port Elizabeth. What is generally unknown is that Mini loved classical music and sang in various choirs including those of whites unconnected with the struggle for freedom. This by itself in

apartheid-minded South Africa was recognition of this great son of Africa's musical talents. Mini always joked about this afterwards saying he had carried the 'gospel of Congress' further by way of song. This allusion to the gospel refers to a song Mini composed during the Defiance Campaign:

'Mayihambe le vangeli
Mayigqib' ilizwe lonke'

(Let this gospel spread and be known throughout the world).

Mini also composed these four songs on which we will briefly comment because they deal with the present stage of struggle:

- a) 'Thath' umthwalo Buti sigoduke
balindile oomama noo bab' ekhaya'

(Collect your things and let's go home, brother, our mothers and fathers are waiting for us at home). This song expressed how tired Mini and other treason trialists were of the four-year-old treason trial that failed in the end. This song now inspires South African refugees everywhere. They shall go home one day.

- b) 'Izakunyathel' i Afrika
Verwoerd shoo
Uza kwenzakala'

(Africa will trample you underfoot Verwoerd. Beware you shall die).

- c) 'Naants' indod' emnyama
Verwoerd Pasopa naants' indod' emnyama
Verwoerd'

(Behold the advancing Blacks Verwoerd, Beware the advancing Blacks Verwoerd). In this song Mini made use of a common Afrikaans phrase 'Pas op' meaning 'Beware' or 'Look out'.

- d) 'Siza kubadubula ngembai-mbai,
Bazakubaleka,
Dubula ngembai-mbai!!'

(We shall shoot the oppressors with cannon, they are going to flee before us—shoot, shoot with cannon!) This is more than merely voicing what will be done in future, but it is a command—'shoot, shoot with cannon!'

We have only referred to Mini's freedom songs, but he has also composed choral pieces that are sung in the Eastern Cape. Mini was the leader of the Treason Trial Choir together with Oliver Tambo. As

we have pointed out, there are songs in all languages that are sung by the freedom fighters in South Africa, one being a calypso in English:

‘Take the country the Castro/Zanzibar way.’

In a nutshell the freedom songs in whose development Mini played a significant role will be sung for ages. Those who throttled his baritone into silence shall be cast into the limbo of despised and forgotten things. These songs that identify our struggle with those of the people of Cuba and Zanzibar bring us into the march forward by humanity to peace, freedom and happiness for all on earth.

Freedom songs are the songs of a New Africa, they cannot be crushed.

(* ‘A Poem of Vengeance’, the picture above it—a tribute by an American artist—and ‘South African Freedom Songs’, are all reprinted from ‘Spotlight on South Africa’, published by the ANC of SA in Dar Es Salaam.)

FROM THE DEATH CELL

I AM PRESENTLY awaiting execution at Pretoria Central Gaol, having been sentenced to death at the beginning of the year.

On October 2nd, 1964, Captain Geldenhuys and two other policemen came to see me. They asked me if I had been informed that my appeal had been dismissed. I said, ‘Yes’. They said, did I know that our advocates admitted in Court that we were guilty of all the other cases except the murder. I told them I was not interested to know from *them* what my advocates said.

They then said that there is still a chance for me to be saved as they knew I was the big boss of the movement in the Eastern Cape. I must tell them where the detonators and revolvers were, and they would help me.

I told them that if they studied the evidence against me they would understand that I was only implicated about the detonators indirectly, but I wasn’t there. I told them that if they wanted to know about the revolvers, they could go to Kholisile Mdwai—he would help them best and would be happy to do so—as he had done at the trial.

They then asked me about Wilton Mkwayi—they said I saw Mkwayi in January 1963—I said, ‘yes’—they asked me if I was prepared to give evidence against Mkwayi, whom they had now arrested. I said, ‘No, I was not.’ They said there is a good chance for them to save me from the gallows if I was prepared to assist then. I refused to assist.

They then said, would I make the ‘Amandla’ salute when I walked the last few paces to the gallows. I said, ‘Yes’. After a few more jokes of that nature they left.

VUYISILE MINI

THE BATTLE FOR THE CONGO

AND THE NOVEMBER AGGRESSION

A. Lerumo

ON NOVEMBER 22nd, 1964, Belgian and United States troops boarded military aircraft on the British-occupied island of Ascension, off the coast of Angola. They flew to Stanleyville in the Congo and there joined in the savage war of destruction spearheaded by the fascist scum of white South Africans and others on Tshombe's payroll, against the people of the Congo and the Revolutionary Government headed by Christopher Gbenye.

It was the most blatant act of aggression by regular foreign troops in Africa since July 1960, when the United Nations Security Council ordered the Belgian government to 'withdraw its troops from the territory of the Congo'. It was also a continuance of the all-out struggle which the combined forces of international imperialism have been waging for control over the Congo ever since Patrice Lumumba, in the presence of King Baudouin, launched the new Republic with an announcement to the world that he and his people would insist not only on the appearance but also on the reality of independence. From that day onward the Congo has been a crucial battlefield in Africa's struggle for liberation.

The people's struggles in the Congo, and the rising tide of national resistance all over Africa, had forced the Belgian colonialists to recognize that direct colonial rule was no longer viable. Following the example of Britain and France, the Belgians hoped confidently that under the cover of a purely nominal independence they would be able to continue dominating the country as before, controlling its economy, its civil service and police, and extracting vast profits from its resources and cheap labour for the benefit of the Union Miniere and other powerful monopolies.

These hopes were rudely shattered. Lumumba was no puppet, and

under his courageous leadership the Congo people stood upright, after generations of colonialist oppression, to assert their will to freedom. The uncompromising Independence Day speech at Leopoldville was followed by purposeful measures to establish the sovereignty and integrity of the Republic. The Belgian officials who monopolized the top places in the police and other state services were replaced by Africans. Lumumba acted swiftly to strengthen ties of friendship between the Congo and other independent African states, and with the Asian and socialist countries. The authority of the Congo was secured at the United Nations.

These determined measures produced a state of shock, almost amounting to panic, not only in Belgium but in all the imperialist countries. The powerful anti-African financial interests, with their close ties with the state machinery, in Wall Street, London, Paris, Johannesburg and Salisbury, with their vast stake in African wealth and exploitation, awoke to the threat posed to the enormous profits they were harvesting not only in the wealthy Congo itself but in all African territories, not least the strongholds of colonialism in the south. In normal conditions of the capitalist jungle, these interests are forever at one another's throats. But, faced with this crisis, they joined forces in a joint 'rescue operation' of collective imperialism, an alliance of beasts of prey to crush the reality and the spirit of Congo independence and drown it in blood. A tremendous barrage of lying propaganda was launched against the Republic, and against Lumumba in particular. Vast sums of money, and every resource of intrigue and corruption, were set in motion to disrupt and undermine the newly-established government and its inexperienced cadres whom the Belgians had systematically deprived of opportunities for education and administrative positions.

The key move of the colonialists was to fragmentize the Congo; in particular to use their creature Tshombe to break away mineral-rich Katanga as an 'independent state'—in reality as a neo-colony. In 1960 as in 1964, Tshombe did not hesitate to enlist the worst enemies of African freedom and dignity to slaughter his fellow-countrymen. Mercenaries were recruited from amongst Belgians, white South Africans and Rhodesians, Nazi adventurers left over from the second world war, French Foreign Legionnaires and O.A.S. thugs, their hands dripping with the blood of Algerian patriots.

With indecent haste, the Belgian imperialists dropped the pose of conferrers of independence on the grateful Africans. The Belgian Government poured its troops, equipped with the latest NATO arms, into the Congo. The sinister, utterly unscrupulous American Central

Intelligence Agency (C.I.A.) spread its tentacles everywhere. Millions were poured out to corrupt politicians, to spread economic disorder and social unrest, in an all-out effort to smash the Republic and to destroy Patrice Lumumba and the spirit of revolutionary African liberation which he personified.

THE APPEAL TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Lumumba, faced by this direct military aggression and imperialist intervention, was in a painfully difficult position. The only regular armed troops at his disposal were the *Force Publique*—recruited and trained by the Belgian colonialists for the purpose of suppressing the Congolese people and their national liberation movement. Although the Belgian officers had been replaced, the loyalty and discipline of this force, and its reliability in a war of patriotic defence against Belgian troops, were extremely questionable. As soon became abundantly clear, Colonel Mobutu, its head, was already taking his orders from the C.I.A. To whom then was Lumumba to turn? The independent African states were, at that time, far fewer in number (of thirty-five African states today, only nine achieved independence before 1960) and few were in a position, either politically or militarily, to help stem the imperialist aggression. (It is worth recalling that even the Ghana army was then still officered by British army men.) The socialist countries would, no doubt, have been prepared to stand by the Republic—had they been asked to do so. Lumumba himself, in one of his last public statements, declared: 'The Soviet Union proved to be the only one of the great powers which, from the very beginning, supported the people of the Congo in their struggle'.

But the Lumumba government issued no such appeal—and when one considers the extent to which President Kasavubu and other colleagues of the late Prime Minister were already involved in United States intrigues, it is not difficult to understand the reason why.

On the advice of the other African governments Lumumba then took the only other alternative which then seemed open to him—he appealed to the Security Council of the United Nations for assistance to repel Belgian aggression. If the United Nations' deeds had matched its words and professions, if it had even been an organization whose executive machinery was prepared to carry out the clear-cut and unambiguous decisions of its leading bodies, this appeal would have saved the situation. But the United States and other colonialist powers dominated the administrative apparatus of the United Nations headed by the secretary-general, the late Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, and these powers were determined by hook or by crook to get rid of Prime Minister Lumumba and to re-establish foreign domination over the Congo.

The decision of the Security Council, backed by the Afro-Asian and the socialist countries, was precise in its wording and clear in its intentions—to assist the Republic of the Congo to repel the Belgian aggressors. The Belgians were told to get their troops out of the Congo. The secretary-general was authorized *in consultation with the Lumumba government* to provide that government with such military assistance as it needed, and until ‘with the technical assistance’ of the United Nations it could build adequate defences of its own. And that was all. But the colonialists distorted and far exceeded this mandate; and the United Nations force was used not to implement the resolution but to sabotage its purpose. Instead of being placed at the disposal of the Lumumba government, United Nations troops acted as an independent force to intervene in Congo affairs against their host, Lumumba, whose

‘We can do our best to help all those inside the Congo itself like Mr. Tshombe who, as he has shown again and again, stands for the same things as we do.’

Lord Salisbury (of the British South Africa Chartered Company) in the *Daily Telegraph*,
December 8th, 1964

request was their only authority for being there. The results were tragic. When, at the last moment (it is impossible not to feel that things would have turned out very differently had he done so sooner) and as a last resort, Lumumba tried to mobilize his real strength—the mass support he overwhelmingly enjoyed—he found his entry to the radio station barred by United Nations troops.

The end of the tragic story is well known: the illegal dissolution of Parliament by Kasavubu and Mobutu at the behest of the C.I.A., the illegal deposition of Lumumba, his kidnapping and assassination. (How ironic that the criminals responsible for this foul deed are today among those championed by Washington, Bonn, Paris, Brussels, London and Pretoria as members of the ‘legal government’!) In his brilliant exposure of this disgraceful episode in United Nations history, *To Katanga and Back*, a relentless searchlight has been cast on all these shabby proceedings by one United Nations official who remained loyal to the original Security Council resolution—Dr. Conor Cruise O’Brien.

These outrageous crimes of the Belgian, United States, British and other colonialists aroused a continual and mounting storm of criticism and opposition at the United Nations. Time and again the African, Asian and Socialist delegates exposed and angrily denounced the use of United Nations authority to cover blatant neo-colonialism. The Soviet Union refused—and still does—to pay a penny towards the

infamous 'United Nations' adventure in the Congo. It was such pressure which led to the abandonment of the 'Katanga secession' plan, the recall in July 1961 of the Congo Parliament, and the eventual departure, in 1964, of the 'United Nations' military force.

But, by then, neo-colonialist, especially United States, economic penetration, corruption and indirect domination had established their ascendancy. The colonialists no longer needed the fiction of Katanga 'Independence', and the man who had identified himself with that sorry cause, Moïse Tshombe was retired from the limelight and from the Congo. He left, with plenty of money (his choice of a place of exile is illuminating!) for fascist Spain, and it seemed justifiable to hope that we had seen the last of him in public affairs. It was a mark of the desperation of the neo-colonialists and the bankruptcy of their agents in Leopoldville, that they should, in the latter part of 1964, have brought back this discredited politician in the role of 'Prime Minister' of the Congo.

Neither the various puppet administrations at Leopoldville nor their United States and other imperialist backers had come an inch closer to the solution of the many problems of this key African country. The pace of exploitation, of the shipping abroad of the wealth of the nation, was accelerated, but the conditions of the masses deteriorated. The progressive measures initiated under Lumumba, such as Africanization, were reversed; Belgian and other colonialist personnel flocked back into what was once again developing into a haven of white domination; dollars for 'aid' streamed into the pockets of politicians and civil servants. While corruption and extravagance flourished in high places the conditions of the starving masses went from bad to worse. On the borders of the Congo the tide of the African Revolution rose higher and higher; the neo-colonialist regime in Brazzaville was overthrown and the shaky military dictatorship in the Sudan was on its last legs. The Congo itself was seething with revolt; the masses of the people remained loyal to Lumumba's colleagues Gizenga and Gbenye; Kasavubu and other imperialist agents clung to office only by virtue of foreign support and the so-called 'United Nations' forces were about to depart. Only extreme measures could stem the tide of popular revolt around the revolutionary Gbenye government—and the C.I.A. men calculated that only a Tshombe could be ruthless and unscrupulous enough to carry them out.

His return, in the role of 'Prime Minister' was paraded as a move for 'national unity', and Mr. Gizenga was released from his long detention on a remote island and allowed back to the capital under close surveillance, to give some colour to this manoeuvre. But few were deceived. The Organization of African Unity, in session at Cairo,

refused to allow Tshombe to attend; the democratic revolutionary government forces headed by Gbenye were making a triumphant advance, routing the demoralized and undisciplined remnants of the *Force Publique*, occupying many important areas including the city of Stanleyville.

Quickly shedding the pretence at patriotic national unity, Tshombe resorted to the methods which had made him so universally hated in 1960 and 1961 of employing fanatically anti-African white terrorists as mercenaries, and even appealing for open United States and Belgian government military intervention against the people of the Congo.

Within three months of Tshombe's return from Spain all the key posts in the administration were once again being handed back to Belgians. Even the special correspondent of the London *Times* in Elizabethville revealed that, in the civil service,

Nominally the Africans remain in charge, but planning and execution are being handed over more and more to Europeans, mainly Belgians. Mr. Tshombe has, for example, authorized the employment of Belgian police officers to reorganize the Elisabethville police force and, it is reported, the police forces of other provinces as well.

The Times, October 22nd, 1964.

Not unsurprisingly, *The Times* correspondent does not blame the Belgians for 'this sort of close relationship' with Tshombe. They have 'a legitimate interest', he comments cynically, 'in seeing that their goose goes on laying its profitable copper eggs'. But he acknowledges that the Belgians 'are not coming back to train the Congolese but to take over responsibility from them'. And he is even more worried at the effects, particularly on the relationships between the Congo and its African neighbours, of the continued presence of the mercenaries, 'the majority from South Africa and Southern Rhodesia'. It is 'widely believed' he writes 'that they will remain in the Congo on one pretext or another' after the recapture of Stanleyville. These beliefs have been confirmed. According to the Johannesburg *Star* the recruiting office in the centre of that city was still open in December 1964—the newspaper obligingly also provides a Benoni telephone number where enquiries can be made—and adds that:

There are plenty of volunteers anxious to join up with the South African mercenaries who already form the bulk of the Congo's 'foreign legion'. The word has gone out that more white soldiers are needed.

It is no accident that Tshombe should look for, and find, willing volunteers among the whites of Southern Africa, inculcated from childhood with fanatical anti-African race prejudice, and only too eager to join in the jolly sport of shooting down blackskins. Mr. Christopher

Gbenye, head of the Revolutionary Government of the Congo, charged in a statement from Paulis, Northern Congo, that more than 10,000 men, women and children had been slaughtered by this 'army of savage white mercenaries'. It can hardly be supposed that the Belgian,

'Mr. Tshombe is Prime Minister of the Congo today largely by the grace of Belgian civilian and military assistance and South African volunteers.'

Special Correspondent in Elizabethville of
The Times (London), October 20th, 1964

American and British personnel, official and unofficial, who are more than adequately represented in the Congo, could have remained in ignorance of these appalling atrocities. None of them uttered a word or protest.

Yet all of a sudden, in the middle of November, a tremendous barrage of propaganda was launched in the imperialist press, television and other media, about the threat to the lives of the few hundred Europeans and white Americans said to be held as 'hostages' in the territory under the control of the Revolutionary Government centred at that time at Stanleyville. This propaganda furnished the excuse for the direct aggression of November 22nd, in which United States and Belgian troops were flown from the British-controlled island of Ascension to reinforce Tshombe's white mercenaries attacking revolutionary Stanleyville.

THE AGGRESSION OF NOVEMBER 22nd

It is revolting beyond words that under cover of this allegedly 'humanitarian' mission, three big imperialist powers should join in an act of blatant aggression and intervention in an African state. Where were all these fine humanitarian sentiments, one may ask, when Verwoerd's fascist mercenaries were massacring helpless men, women and children in Congo villages? Or are we to take it that Labour Britain, the United States, self-proclaimed leader of the 'free world', and Belgium, care nothing for the lives of dark-skinned people, but are prepared to rush in with troops the moment a far smaller number of fair-skinned people are said to be in danger?


As Dr. O'Brien (*The Observer*, December 6th, 1962) pointed out:

Many Africans regard the 'Congo-Belgian-American mercy mission' as the use of a humanitarian pretext for the extension of the rule of the Belgians and their associates, through the complaisant Government of Leopoldville, over the whole of the resources and the strategic space of the former Belgian Congo. The condemnations of this intervention by African Governments and by the Commission of the Organization of

African Unity in no way exaggerates the bitterness of African opinion on this; if anything, they understate.

Dr. O'Brien concludes his article by suggesting that the 'Europeans and Americans', 'having rescued some hundreds of whites from the blacks', should now 'set about rescuing several millions of blacks from whites'. But it is very questionable indeed whether any whites at all were 'rescued', whether they were ever in any danger, and whether in fact the deaths of whites that took place must not be squarely laid at the door of the so-called 'rescue operation' itself.

In his statement released in Nairobi by the Kenya Press Agency on December 8th, Mr. Gbenye placed the blame for the death of foreign nationals and prisoners of war fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the mercenaries and interventionists. He denied that any people at all had been 'held as hostages' and declared that the Revolutionary



Government had 'always safeguarded and will safeguard the security of persons' of all races and nationalities.

Up to November 22nd at 6 a.m. not a single drop of blood had been shed (in the area controlled by the revolutionaries). Since the arrival of Belgian paratroops and commandos on November 22nd a real massacre has taken place.

Mr. Gbenye related what had actually happened in the 'negotiations' with Belgian and U.S. representatives—which stands in direct contrast with the versions of the same events put out by the colonialists. As long ago as August, he himself had held diplomatic discussions with Mr. Spaak and Mr. Devlin, Washington's special envoy.

Further discussions were held in Nairobi between his envoy, Mr. Thomas Kanza and Mr. William Attwood, the U.S. Ambassador, under the chairmanship of President Jomo Kenyatta.

At 11 p.m. on November 21st I received a message from Paul-Henri Spaak that it was my duty to ensure the security of Belgian nationals living in the regions of the Congo already liberated. At 3 a.m. on November 22nd I replied to Spaak that it was my duty to ensure the security of all inhabitants of the Republic under my control without making any difference of race or religion.

At 6 a.m. on November 22nd, hardly three hours after my reply, the Belgian and American aggression started. The U.S. and Belgium bear the entire responsibility for the consequences.

Hundreds of foreign nationals, prisoners of war and Congolese nationals would not have met their deaths if the unjustified aggression of the U.S. and Belgium had not taken place.

Thus not only was the 'mercy mission' claim put forward as the pretext for the imperialist aggression, completely unjustified in itself. But in fact the aggression itself brought about precisely what it was supposed to prevent—namely, the death of a number of Belgians and other foreigners.

Moreover, the picture of the actual military operation presented to the public in imperialist countries was completely false as well. They put forward a version from which one would imagine that there was no actual fighting, but that they successfully accomplished their allegedly humanitarian mission of removing whites to Elizabethville without difficulty. In fact heavy fighting took place in Stanleyville during the joint attack by Tshombe's mercenaries and the regular Belgian and U.S. troops against the liberation forces. More than ten American planes were shot down and over 500 mercenaries were killed.

Mr. Gbenye said that over 300 prisoners of war fell in fact under the bullets of the mercenaries themselves. This figure is not surprising when he points out that, in their indiscriminate fury of slaughter 'more than ten thousand Congolese men, women and children have been massacred by the army of savage white mercenaries'.

But the International Red Cross, so perturbed about the supposed danger to a relatively small number of whites has said nothing at all about this mass slaughter by Tshombe's hired killers.

LEGAL SUBTERFUGE

The imperialist powers tried to justify their direct intervention and aggression in Stanleyville by the subterfuge that they were in the Congo on the invitation of the 'legal government'. The dubious 'legality' of the Leopoldville junta has been thoroughly and ably exposed by Kgang Dithata in the *African Communist* (No. 18, July-September 1964), who pointed out that Kasavubu had no authority to dismiss Lumumba and suspend Parliament, and every step subsequently taken by him has been illegal in terms of the Constitution.

But even more telling in African eyes is the fact that the Tshombe gang is openly acting not as an African government, but as an open and unashamed agency of foreign imperialist interests. Hardly had the motley gang of United States and Belgian government troops together with the hired white assassins from South Africa and Rhodesia entered Stanleyville, when Tshombe was off by plane to France, Germany and Belgium to report on his satisfactory carrying out of orders and to seek fresh funds.

The *fact* of the matter, legal quibbling aside, is that the Tshombe outfit and its hired gangsters are, and behave like, a savage horde of foreign vandals, massacring entire villages of men, women and children, raping and looting at will. And this is true whether their skins are pink or brown, whether they consist of the so-called Congolese Army (formerly the *Force Publique*) or the loot-crazy mercenaries. The accusation of 'racialism' flung by the colonialists at the African leaders who object to foreign intervention in the Congo is far more applicable to themselves; their press and propaganda assumes with supreme chauvinistic arrogance, that the whites in the Congo are above criticism and must be 'rescued' regardless of the cost in African lives. A far different—and profoundly revealing—aspect is presented by Peter Stenager, a white reporter writing from Leopoldville to the Johannesburg *Sunday Express* on December 13th, in an article the main purpose of which is to praise the 'courage' of the South African mercenaries (several of whose names and addresses are given). After boasting of the superior aggressiveness of the South Africans, and complaining over their treatment and poor pay, he continues:

But for the mercenaries' discontent over wages there have been compensations in Stanleyville. Richly stocked and unluted by the rebels during

their occupation of the town (my emphasis, A.L.) it has been ransacked by mercenaries and Congolese regular troops—unpalatable as this fact may be. The rich cellar of the Stanley Hotel, where most of the Rhodesian and South African men are billeted, has been plundered. Drinks are on the house every night. Meals are free, so is lodging. Every room occupied by mercenaries is stacked with transistor radios, electric shavers, portable record players, records, jewellery, clothing, cigarette lighters, cigarette cases, cigarettes, cigars. The shops of the town are ransacked. The spoils of war have been enjoyed to the full. . . . Several safes—including the strongroom of the bank in Kindu, have been blown. . . . About R60,000 (£30,000) was taken. . . .

Many of the mercenaries are besotted and obsessed with loot. Many are now stealing from each other, and tempers are flaring. Even guns are being drawn on each other.

This graphic picture of the 'forces of law and order' painted by a reporter who is by no means biased in favour of the Revolutionary Government, tells its own story. Could there be any greater contrast between the so-called 'rebels'—who were really concerned with life and property and left the 'richly-stocked' town 'unlooted', and the savage gangsters 'besotted and obsessed with loot', now fighting among themselves like dogs over the spoils?

Just to round off the ugly picture, Mr. Stenager concludes his report with news of fresh 'mopping-up operations' when the mercenaries and Tshombe troops went into an African village near Stanleyville 'suspected of harbouring rebels'.

As I flew out of Stanleyville to file this report, hundreds of prisoners were being brought in for 'interrogation'. Tomorrow the executions, followed by the bodies being dumped in the river, will begin again.

No wonder he reflects that a 'feeling of insecurity' prevails in Stanleyville, a feeling that 'a counter-attack by rebels in mass force could take place again'. The 'feeling of insecurity' will persist in Stanleyville, and every other city of the Congo, until the colonialists' rabble of drunken, thieving, murdering, raping savages, white and black, are indeed defeated by a massive counter-attack by those whom this otherwise vivid and truthful reporter miscalls 'rebels', but who are obviously the only sane and patriotic force in the country which can end the nightmare agony of the Congo and bring tranquillity, national reconstruction and civilized, law-governed, progressive government to this suffering heartland of Africa.

As I write these lines, on the eve of the new year, 1965, there is heartening news of fresh advances by the patriots; and all Africa will hope, and do all we can to ensure, that the new year indeed sees our brothers and sisters in this strife-torn land enter into the legacy of Lumumba, of peace and independence. And also that the criminals in

Leopoldville will at last face the justice and retribution they so richly deserve.

But justice and retribution cannot stop short at the Tshombe gang. Justice demands that their principals—the sinister plotters in the United States, and in Brussels, London, Bonn, Paris and Pretoria—must also answer for the crimes of their tools and agents. These pious humbugs must be taught that crime does not pay; and that the life of a simple peasant in Stanleyville—or for that matter in Vietnam—is just as precious and valuable as that of a fairskinned gentleman who abuses African hospitality, even if he wears a missionary's dog-collar.

THE KATANGA OF AFRICA

The battle for the Congo is not the concern of the Congolese people only; it has become the vital and immediate concern of the people of all Africa. As President Ben Bella pointed out in such striking words:

The whole Congo today has become a Katanga, the Katanga of Africa which menaces Tanzania, menaces Brazzaville Congo, menaces Zambia, menaces Uganda, menaces Angola. . . . If we do nothing about it today the Congo will fall, tomorrow Brazzaville Congo, the day after tomorrow Burundi and Tanzania and after that Zambia, and after that, why not Conakry, Bamako, Cairo, and why not Algiers. . . . The fight for freedom is a common one.

The open imperialist aggression of November 22nd may well prove to have been one of the costliest operations since Suez, in terms of the complete exposure and unmasking of colonialism and neo-colonialism in Africa. The mass demonstrations of the public in many African countries and of African students abroad, like the unequivocal denunciation by the Organization of African Unity, and the fierce condemnations by African, Asian and socialist countries at the United Nations, serve warning on the imperialist powers that Africa will no longer tolerate this alien regime, resting entirely on foreign financial and military support, in the midst of the Continent. In fact to tolerate it means suicide for national independence everywhere; for if the colonialists are allowed to get away with this aggression with impunity there is no African territory which can count itself safe from similar intervention in the future. And we are not prepared to stand by while the former masters of the continent, who have never resigned themselves to their departure, plot and prepare for the recolonization of Africa.

It is not only, therefore, for principled reasons of African solidarity but also because of the imminent threat of imperialist aggression and intrigue in each African state, that every possible aid must be given to the brave revolutionary patriots of the Congo to rid themselves of the regime of traitors and puppets at Elizabethville. The threads run from

the Congo to Angola and Mozambique, to Salisbury and Johannesburg, and to the capitals of the NATO countries, to which Tshombe went running immediately after the November aggression to beg for still more money. They are threads which form part of the web being spun to entrap us all.

There is a further and deeper lesson in these grim events at the close of 1964. It is a humiliating pill to swallow for all Africans that such an act of aggression can still take place without response from our leaders and our countries save that of protest and denunciation. It was altogether proper that we should have protested—and neither history nor

‘I have noticed in visits to Stanleyville that most of the aggression seems to be carried out by the South Africans and Rhodesians under Major Hoare.’

Peter Stenager in the Johannesburg
Sunday Express, December 13th, 1964

the Nigerian people will easily forgive those like the representative of that country at the United Nations who undermined the African protest. But protests alone will not avail us against foreign aircraft and mechanized invaders. The African countries must unite and pool their resources. They must embark on speedy and effective measures to modernize, industrialize, and develop their countries on socialist lines. They must be ready to defend Africa, rid its soil of racialism and colonialism, and deal a devastating counter-blow against any aggressor.

NO MERCY FROM VORSTER

Z. Nkosi

THE NINETY-DAY no-trial clause of the General Laws Amendment Act of 1963 was suspended on January 11th, 1965. Passed during the middle of the 1963 session of Parliament, it came into operation on May 1st, 1963. Eight days later the police made their first arrests under this clause. By November 7th, a total of 544 people had been held without trial. The total number detained while the clause was in operation has not yet been announced, but is believed to be over 1,000.

Vorster, Verwoerd's Nazi Minister of Justice announced the proposed suspension of the ninety-day clause on November 30th, 1964. A few days earlier, on November 26th, he had told the press that the internal security position was 'very good'. The 'mopping up' of subversive elements had taken a little longer than he had expected, but 'we have seen the results of this mopping up in the various court cases'. The situation was such that he could now recommend the suspension of the ninety-day clause, 'barring unforeseen developments'.

Yet although the situation was 'good', arrests under the ninety-day clause continued up to the very moment it was suspended. The intimidation and torture in solitary confinement continued, even though on the Minister's own admission the security position in the country did not warrant it. Clearly the police, backed by the Minister, were reluctant to abandon powers which had made them undisputed masters of the fate of the individual citizen for the previous nineteen months.

Vorster himself indicated that the threat of ninety-day detention still remained. 'We are not resting on our laurels', he said. 'The position will be watched very carefully and I will not hesitate to bring the clause back if the safety of the country demands it. Whether it will be introduced or not depends entirely on the subversive elements'.

The activities of 'external subversive organizations' were 'building up,' he added. 'The moment the clause is suspended subversive (how Vorster loves this word, which in his vocabulary means, simply, anti-Nazi) elements outside might try to take advantage of this and foolish people inside may also be tempted to take up where others left off.'

In fact the suspension of the clause merely means that the isolation of

political prisoners will cease and all detainees will once again have to be brought before a court within forty-eight hours of arrest. It does *not* mean that freedom from arbitrary arrest has been restored to the people. The ninety-day clause remains on the Statute Book and can be brought into operation again at a moment's notice, whenever Vorster decides to do so. And clearly he was unhappy at even temporarily relaxing the clause, which earlier in the year he had refused to abandon, saying he was not willing to 'chop off the hands of my police.'

One of the main factors behind this change of attitude was the powerful protest inside the country. Practically all non-white protests about anything are by now illegal and go unheard, but on this issue many among the whites were moved to raise their voices. It is true that the feeble official opposition Party, the United Party, actually voted for this clause in the whites-only parliament, but the injustice of detention without charge or trial, and still more the repeated reports of physical and mental torture and other police brutalities against defenceless 'ninety-day' detainees, did arouse important sections among the white minority into outspoken opposition. Mr. Hamilton Russell, who had resigned from the United Party and from Parliament on this issue, and former Chief Justice Centlivres, headed the 'Ninety-Day Protest Committee' which campaigned up and down the country against this law. Leaders of Christian, Moslem and Jewish religious communities condemned it; Liberal and Progressive Party spokesmen opposed it; and the opposition newspapers, almost without exception consistently editorialized against it. In Johannesburg alone the Black Sash women's organization held fourteen successive weekly vigils for the repeal of the ninety-day clause. Even though many whites, probably a majority, were prepared to acquiesce in detention without trial and even the use of lawless torture as a weapon to preserve white supremacy, more and more of them showed signs not only of a troubled conscience but even of a willingness to stand up and be counted against these outrages.

Backing them was the whole range of world opinion. Even many in the 'West' who had hitherto remained silent about the evils of apartheid rule were outraged when the details of the torture of ninety-day detainees were made public. Mrs. Helen Suzman, the lone Progressive Party M.P., who returned from a trip overseas just about the time Vorster made his announcement, told the press 'the ninety-day clause had done more to damage South Africa's reputation overseas than any other single event.' (*Rand Daily Mail*, 1st December, 1964.) Though they claim that overseas protests end up in the waste paper basket, the Nationalist Party leaders are in fact very sensitive to

overseas opinion, as they admit when they spend vast sums of public money on foreign propaganda, and declare that 'more attention should be paid' to bodies like Christian Action and the Anti-Apartheid Movement, which are 'damaging South Africa's "image" '.

No doubt the Verwoerd regime hopes that by suspending the ninety-day clause they will be able to counter the effect of the unfavourable publicity it occasioned throughout the world, and to claim that they have restored the rule of law and *habeas corpus*. Nevertheless, the clause remains on the statute book, like all the other fascist legislation introduced by Vorster and his predecessors, which is still in full operation. And the 'detention without trial' clause of the 1963 Criminal Law Amendment Act is still available and can be reintroduced any time a fresh initiative by the resistance movement (or for that matter, another provocation staged by the special branch of the police) can be made the excuse for it. Vorster claims that the reason for suspending the no-trial clause is that the police have succeeded in breaking the back of the resistance movement. 'Some people have learnt their lesson the hard way;' and 'state security' is no longer threatened to the same extent. But the threat that 'if necessary' he would reintroduce the fascist clause at a moment's notice shows that he knows perfectly well the opposition to apartheid rule has not been and never can be eliminated.

So long as there is oppression, so long will there be resistance to it. The liberation movement has its roots deep among the people; roots which neither setbacks nor fascist terror can or will destroy. Certainly there have been heavy blows over the past eighteen months. Phenomena like the Poqo outbursts may come and go; an organization like the 'African Resistance Movement' based on little but desperation and illusions may not be able to survive. Even the senior movements of the people, like the African National Congress and the Communist Party have suffered heavy setbacks, many brilliant and courageous patriots and democrats have been murdered, or sentenced to long jail sentences under barbarous conditions, men and women whom South Africa can ill afford to lose. But these are not ephemeral movements; they existed before Verwoerd's 'National Party', and they will survive it too. The setbacks can only increase their determination to overthrow the white supremacy regime. The lessons 'learnt the hard way' will be learnt—but not the way Vorster meant it. The lesson is not to abandon the fight, but to fight more effectively. New and better methods of struggle and organization will be studied. The fight will continue unremittingly until final victory has been won.

GRIM AND RELENTLESS

The people of South Africa, and the liberatory and political organizations which represent them, can take pride in their achievements over the last few years. These have been difficult, even painful years, for all who have taken any part in South African political life. A grim and relentless struggle has been waged between the oppressors and the oppressed, with no quarter asked or given. Yet, despite all the restrictive laws passed by the Nationalist Government, despite all the apparatus of repression with which they have armed themselves, despite the mind-breaking and killing which they have conducted in lonely prison cells against unarmed and defenceless men and women, all that the Nationalists have achieved has been to create a deeper awareness among the masses of the issues at stake, a political consciousness on a scale we have never known before.

Politics is no longer the preserve of a handful of politicians mouthing phrases at public meetings. Politics, it is now realised by the masses, is a matter of bread and butter, which enters into the life of every man, woman and child. Politics determines your way of life, whether you are free or slave; whether your child has education and opportunities to progress or is doomed to perpetual manual labour, on starvation wages; whether you can live together with your wife and children or are herded together with other husbands and fathers into gigantic, soulless 'bachelor' barracks; whether you eat or starve, as thousands of Africans are starving at this very moment in many of the rural areas while the South African economy is allegedly experiencing the greatest 'boom' in its history. It is politics which makes the white man boss and gives him every privilege and advantage while the mass of the people see their living standards constantly declining, the gap between the haves and the have-nots ever widening. It is politics which has turned the people towards the path of struggle and made them realise that only through their own efforts will the path to the future depicted in the Freedom Charter adopted at Kliptown in 1955 be opened up.

The great achievement of the Nationalist Government is that it has politicised the people. Their apartheid laws on the one hand and their punitive laws on the other have forced the entire Non-white population, together with ever increasing numbers of sympathetic Whites, into the arena of struggle. The decade of non-violent struggle which followed the Nationalists' accession to power culminated in the 1960 State of Emergency in which 2,000 of the top leaders of the people of all races were detained without trial and 20,000 others were arrested and sent to work camps in terms of the emergency regulations. Not all the brutality and repression of the previous twelve years—the

passing of laws like the Criminal Laws Amendment Act and the Public Safety Act of 1953, the bannings and jailings and exiling of political opponents, the treason trial, etc.—succeeded in stamping out the spirit of revolt amongst the people. On the contrary it blazed up higher than ever, and the years since the 1960 State of Emergency ended have seen the most sustained and intense struggle between the Government and the people that this country has ever known.

The general emergency was barely over when another emergency had to be declared in the Transkei, where the peasants' revolt succeeded for a short while in overthrowing the apparatus of government in Pondoland and substituting a form of people's government. The Government managed to crush this revolt only by full-scale deployment of the police and the army, and resort to the most Nazi-like measures such as the wholesale removal of populations, burning of huts, and the beating and terrorising of the population under the proclamations 400 and 413 issued in December 1960, which made meetings illegal, turned 'subversive' talk into a crime and enabled the police to detain anyone indefinitely without trial. The fact that proclamations 400 and 413 are still in force is in itself testimony that, though the 1960 revolt was put down, the danger of further rebellion remains as great as ever. In fact, resistance to government measures has never ceased in the African reserves, least of all in the Transkei, where in 1963 no fewer than 592 people were detained under the emergency proclamations. Figures for 1964 are not yet available, but detentions continued, indicating that resistance continued. And if one sought confirmation of the feelings of the people of the Transkei, one need only look at the results of the first Transkei elections in November 1963, when a majority of the elected seats were won by opponents of apartheid, despite all the Government could do by way of banning and even jailing the more outspoken of the participants. That this result was no flash in the pan was proved by the first by-election held in November 1964, when the Democratic Party candidate standing for multi-racialism won a clear majority over the combined totals of the Matanzima nominee supporting apartheid and an independent. The leader of the Transkei opposition, Paramount Chief Victor Poto, commented that the election result was a 'clear vote of confidence' in the Democratic Party's policy of multi-racial democracy and showed that the people of the Transkei totally rejected separate development. (*Star*, November 28th, 1964.)

If resistance has continued without pause in the reserves, the urban areas have by no means lagged behind. Although both the A.N.C. and the P.A.C. had been banned, the people's organizations began to rally their forces immediately the 1960 emergency was over, and

in December 1960, at the African leaders' conference in Johannesburg, decided to go ahead with preparations for a campaign against the inauguration of the Nationalist Republic on May 31st, 1961. The campaign, launched at the great Maritzburg conference in March 1961, took the form of a call for a new national convention representative of all races, to draw up a new constitution for South Africa based on equal rights for all, failing which mass demonstrations would be staged on the eve of the declaration of the Republic. It was Nelson Mandela who made the leading speech at the Maritzburg conference, and won his way into the undisputed leadership of the African resistance by his conduct of the three-day general strike at the end of May and his decision thereafter, announced on June 26th, to lead the movement of resistance from underground.

Some have dubbed the 1961 strike a 'failure'. Certainly it failed to bring about a national convention or to stop the inauguration of Verwoerd's republic. But it was nevertheless successful in mobilising the support of the overwhelming majority of the non-white peoples, and the demand for a national convention and the preparations for the strike completely overshadowed the Nationalist celebrations of their apartheid republic. It was news of the strike and not of the Republic which hit the newspaper headlines on May 29th, 30th and 31st. And the demand of the Maritzburg conference for a new national convention was echoed by surprisingly large segments of White opinion. Tens of thousands of people of all races took part in what was in effect the greatest national political strike ever witnessed in South Africa. Once again the Government could only cope with the situation by a programme of mass repression. Police and troops were mobilized. A twelve-day no bail law was rushed through Parliament. The Maritzburg conference committee was arrested on a charge under the Suppression of Communism Act. All meetings were banned from May 19th to June 26th. In preliminary sweeps in the townships, 10,000 so-called 'tsotsis and vagrants' were arrested and many of them endorsed out of town. Leaders of the people's organizations who could be found were arrested and detained under the twelve-day no-bail law.

The May 1961 strike was no failure in its effect on the people. Far from dampening their determination to struggle, it inspired them to intensify their efforts and to work out new tactics to ensure that the struggle should be pushed to greater heights in the future. As all forms of legal struggle became more and more difficult and costly to conduct, the people turned their minds to retaliate against the ceaseless violence of the authorities. It was the post-strike period of 1961 which saw the abandonment of the period of exclusively non-violent struggle by the people in South Africa.

THE SABOTAGE CAMPAIGN

Umkhonto we Sizwe announced its existence on December 16th, 1961, with a series of explosions and a proclamation that 'The people's patience is not endless. The time comes in the life of any nation when there remain only two choices—submit or fight. That time has now come in South Africa'. Those who quarrel with the course that has been followed by the people's organizations since 1961 should remember, that the decision to resort to violence was not one imposed on the people by their leaders, but one imposed on the leadership by the people, driven beyond the bounds of patience by the intolerable tyranny and provocation of the Government and its mass of repressive laws. Nelson Mandela told the court in the Rivonia trial that he and his colleagues had planned sabotage 'not because of a spirit of recklessness nor because I have any love of violence. I planned it as a calm and sober assessment of the political situation.' Perhaps the same could not be said of the Poqo movement, still less of Leballo's provocative announcement at Maseru of a plan to kill whites indiscriminately. Yet, whatever one may think of Poqo and its leaders, it did show that even among politically unsophisticated and inarticulate Africans there was a widespread understanding and acceptance of the 'simple truth that: 'there remain only two choices—submit or fight'. However crudely, they showed in action that they were not prepared to submit, that they were willing to fight. Nor was the resort to violence limited to Umkhonto we Sizwe and Poqo. Other groups took part in organized sabotage: the 'National Liberation Committee' the 'African Resistance Movement'—and several other groups besides, some acting entirely on their own, all determined to register, in what they believed to be the only way left to them, their determination to bring about a change in South Africa, to help smash apartheid and build a new society based on one man one vote.

The full extent of the sabotage campaign in South Africa will probably never be known. In the Rivonia trial alone nearly 200 acts of sabotage were cited, of most of which the public had never been informed until then, because it was official policy to play down sabotage, and the press only reported those cases which could not be concealed. Nor will we ever know precisely how many people were involved in sabotage, though the number certainly runs into thousands. South Africa was plunged into a new form of warfare, in which the respective armies were deployed in the dark, and both sides could only guess at the resources of the other. But some idea can be obtained from figures of arrests and trials during the last two years. According to the Minister of Justice, a total of 3,355 South Africans were detained under various

security laws in 1963. And according to calculations by the newspaper *Forward*, there were in the period between March 1963 and August 1964 a total of 111 political trials in which 1,315 persons were charged. The full extent of the people's efforts may perhaps be gauged by the price they have had to pay for them. Of the 1,315 persons charged, forty-four were sentenced to death, twelve to life imprisonment, 894 to 5,713 years' imprisonment and one to six lashes. Only 340 of the accused were acquitted, while the results in the remaining cases were not known.

These were the cases which came before the courts. But the struggle was also waged in isolated prison cells up and down the country where the 1,000 political detainees under the ninety-day no-trial law were subjected to interrogation, third degree and outright torture by Vorster's police thugs. To the roll of martyrs of the people's movement must be added the glorious names of Looksmart Ngudle, James Tyityi and Suliman (Babla) Salojee, who died rather than betray their comrades; not to mention the numbers of others who suffered grievous injury of mind and body at the hands of the torturers. The names of traitors like Beyleveld, Leftwich, Mtolo and Mtembu, who bought their own freedom by giving evidence against their former comrades, today stink in the nostrils of all decent-minded people; but their infamy should not be allowed to obscure the heroism of the vast majority of detainees, who endured all the pain and agony of detention without forsaking their principles or betraying their colleagues.

We shall never forget the heroism of Mini, Khayingo and Mkaba, true freedom fighters who lost their lives in the struggle against fascism in South Africa. When Mini, while awaiting execution in the condemned cell after his appeal had been dismissed, was offered his life in exchange for giving evidence against his comrades in another sabotage trial, he refused indignantly. The police dogs sneered: 'And I suppose you will be shouting "Amandla" when you go off to be hanged?' And Mini replied gravely: 'Yes, I will'. It is reported from jail that he led the singing of freedom songs in the condemned cells until the day he died. Of such stuff are the people's heroes made.

In addition to those who have given their lives in the struggle, there must be today at least 2,000 political prisoners on Robben Island and in other prisons in South Africa. Some of them are serving life sentences, like Mandela, Sisulu, Mbeki, Kathrada, Goldberg and the other Rivonia accused. Even those who are serving shorter sentences may be detained in prison after the expiry of their sentences, like P.A.C. leader Sobukwe. It may be that all political prisoners will remain in jail until the Nationalist government is overthrown. Certainly, it is

the deliberate policy of the Verwoerd Government to break political prisoners both mentally and physically, so that if and when they finally get out they will be of as little value to humanity and their movement as the vicious vindictiveness of their jailors can ensure. Political prisoners are placed in the lowest category, 'D', entitled to the least privileges, the fewest letters and visits from their dear ones. Warders behave towards them with the utmost hostility and cruelty. Many are kept in solitary confinement every bit as strict as under ninety days. None of them, Vorster has promised, will get remission for good conduct.

Some critics have murmured that the price which has been paid by the movement for the achievements of the last few years has been too high, that the sabotage campaign was a ghastly mistake, that the policy of violence must be abandoned. It is true, a high price has been paid. The movement grieves over the deaths of its loved ones, and can ill afford the loss of leaders of the calibre of Mandela and Sisulu. It is true that mistakes have been made. But these mistakes were not that our leaders decided to fight back or that they chose the method of sabotage at that phase. They were mistakes of insufficient vigilance and inadequate organization. These serious mistakes and security lapses have resulted in grievous losses being inflicted on the people's cause. But while regretting the faults and weaknesses of the past, and vowing to correct them, let us not diminish the value of the contribution which has been made by those who have suffered, and indeed by the movement as a whole. We repeat, the road of violence was not chosen by the people's organizations, but forced upon them by the intransigence of the Government. Is the alternative of submission preferable? Must the non-whites then accept apartheid and a second-class status? Must we be satisfied to have our leaders banned, banished and deprived of citizenship rights if they oppose the Government? Must we accept poverty wages and unemployment, endorsements out of town, the destruction of our home life, the blasting of the careers of our children? The opponents of apartheid have neglected, and will neglect, no opportunity to carry on whatever legal forms of struggle for political rights and decent living standards there may be, wherever possible. But let us not forget how limited these have become. Though the South African Congress of Trade Unions is not actually banned, every single official has been banned so that it is no longer able to function and it is not even possible to find staff to man the empty offices. Teenage children may not even stage a protest against ninety-day detention without interference from the police, who broke up their demonstration in Fordsburg on November 18th, confiscated their placards and

took the names and addresses of the participants. The people's organizations, the Communist Party, the A.N.C. and the P.A.C., the Congress of Democrats have been banned. The people's press has been banned, and the few independent journals of opinion which remain are under daily and growing attack.

Vorster, in a speech on December 5 denied that the police were the tools of the Government to suppress free speech and political opinion. 'We as policemen are only opposed to subversion—opposition is one thing, but subversion is another. We as policemen are not interested and not concerned about the political views of the people in South Africa'. We know, and he knows too, that he lies. When he took office he said that 'rights were getting out of hand' and he has systematically destroyed all rights ever since. At this very moment his Government is planning legislation to prevent Opposition parties from carrying on any sort of political activity among Non-Whites, to whom only Verwoerd Nationalists are to be allowed access. It is this Government which has clamped on South Africa the tightest censorship system ever known outside Nazi Germany, and proposes to introduce state control of the press in the near future. It is Vorster who proposes to debar listed teachers and advocates from their professions for no other reason than that they have opinions he does not like (or had in the dim and distant past). It is Vorster who told the Free State congress of the Nationalist Party on September 17th, 1964: 'If Liberals want to work with the Communists they must bear the same blame and the same penalties. It was clear that the jingoes, the Liberalists and the Communists lay in the same trench to shoot at the government'.

No matter what the losses and mistakes of the past, we come back to the same position—submit or fight. Nor should we feel we have fought in vain, that the sacrifices of the people have been for nothing. Those who have led or taken part in the struggle over the past few years were true pioneers and trail blazers, charting the road to the future. Their efforts have been prodigious. They have changed the thinking not only of their own people but of the people of the whole world. They have shown that the people of South Africa are ready to fight and sacrifice for their freedom. They have shown that in the conditions which prevail in South Africa the revolutionary way forward is the only way.

The very introduction of the ninety-day law showed that the people's movement in South Africa had reached such proportions that it was only by resort to naked force and the abandonment of any pretext of the rule of law that the Government was able to deal with it. The

clash of battle in South Africa had its echoes throughout the rest of the world. Resolutions at the United Nations condemning apartheid and calling for the abandonment of political trials and the release of all political prisoners have been passed by record majorities, with only the Verwoerd representative having the cheek to vote against. Both Britain and America, South Africa's main trading partners, have been forced to impose an arms embargo, and the question of full sanctions is being brought ever more into the forefront.

The special branch of the South African police, headed by Balthazar Vorster, enjoyed the period of the ninety-day clause and the unlimited licence they considered it gave them to inflict sadistic tortures on men and women whose shoelaces they are not fit to tie. Lt. Swanepoel told the court in the Rivonia trial that this law was 'a mighty weapon in the hands of the police'. They have abandoned this 'mighty power' temporarily and reluctantly in the hope that they may now be accepted by the world as respectable, law-abiding and civilised people. The hope is in vain. They cannot wipe out from the memories of the South African people, or those of the outside world, the truth that has emerged—that they are nothing but a gang of brutal thugs and murderers who tried, as the gestapo and the Algerian O.A.S. did before them, to crush noble people's movements of national liberation by terror, assassination and torture. In the end they will fail, as their predecessors failed; in the end retribution will overtake them. 1963 and 1964 will never be forgotten, and Vorster and his special branch will be made to account for every patriot they have murdered and physically and mentally maimed in their grim prison cells.

Mr. Vorster, we can tell you right now that whether your ninety-day clause is in operation or not, the resistance against your tyranny and that of your Government will continue. Call your enemies subversive or foolish as you like, but they will never bow down to apartheid. Yes, new freedom fighters will take up where others left off. And because of the wounds which you have inflicted on the movement in the past, our soldiers in future will be more battle-hardened, better trained and more determined than ever to see this fight through to the end. 'Submit or fight'—that is our watchword. And we will never submit.

'CHEATED NOT DEFEATED'

Background to British Guiana Election

George David

gives the background to the imperialist onslaught in British Guinea, which led to the recent rigged elections and the removal of the majority party, Dr. Jagan's People's Progressive Party, from office.

(This article was written on the eve of the elections of December 7th, 1964. The 'proportional representation' system was introduced by the Tory government, against the background of terror and intervention described by Mr. David, in order to ensure the removal of the P.P.P. from office. In the meantime, the Tories themselves were rejected by the British electorate. The Jagan administration appealed to the new Labour government to throw overboard the Tory plan, deliberately engineered to remove fellow-socialists from office, but the appeal fell on deaf ears. Emerging yet again as the strongest party, the P.P.P. increased its total vote to 109,332 and its overall percentage from 42.63 to 45.88—more than the Labour Party had obtained in Britain. Dr. Jagan refused to resign as Prime Minister—so the British government rushed through yet another amendment to the Constitution to force him out and called on Mr. Burnham of the P.N.C. to take over. The People's Progressive Party has, under the slogan 'We were cheated, not defeated', launched a countrywide campaign with the following five demands:

- 1. Release all P.P.P. detainees*
- 2. Reorganise police and security forces to reflect the broad masses*
- 3. New constitutional arrangements*
- 4. Change the electoral system and hold new elections*
- 5. Right to vote at the age of eighteen.*

'There can be no stable government without the P.P.P.,' declared Dr. Jagan.)

WHEN ANALYSING the present political crisis in British Guiana, we must look in retrospect at the development of the national liberation movement in Guiana and of the People's Progressive Party (P.P.P.) which has won three consecutive general elections and has led this movement up to the present day.

The P.P.P. was formed in 1948 and the present leader, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, was directly responsible for the formation of the Party. The reasons for the creation of the Party are to be found in the suffering of the Guianese people at the hands of British and American colonialism which has ruled the country ruthlessly from the days when the Afro-Guianese were taken from Africa as slaves and the Indo-Guianese were lured to Guiana as indenture workers to work on the sugar plantations.

It was against this background of hunger, disease and the lack of educational facilities for the masses of the Guianese people that the P.P.P. was born.

By 1953, the newly formed P.P.P. was able to unite the entire working class in our country who had been languishing for honest leadership. Before this period many so-called working class leaders had masqueraded before the workers. But because of their insincerity the employers continued to reap huge profits from our country. The large sugar factory owners were able to expand rapidly by opening chain stores throughout British Guiana and sent millions upon millions back to Britain. In fact British Guiana was known as Bookers Guiana (the name of one of the largest sugar companies dominating the sugar industry of the country).

General elections were held in 1953 under adult suffrage which was introduced the same year, at the demand of the P.P.P., and the P.P.P. was elected to office with a landslide majority. This victory alarmed the local sugar barons who undoubtedly had a strong lobby in the British Parliament. The American Government was also up in arms because of the aims of the newly formed P.P.P. to transfer Guiana and its economy from a backward colonial territory to a socialist state where the means of production distribution and exchange would be owned and controlled by the working people.

After only 133 days in office—Westminster and Washington shouted 'communism', 'communism', and Dr. Jagan and his young Government were forcibly thrown out. British battleships and soldiers took over the country. The constitution was suspended. Dr. Jagan himself was gaoled. His wife who was the General Secretary of the P.P.P. was also sent to prison. Wholesale detentions and arrests were the order of the day. Police harassment and imprisonment of all the militant leaders were carried out against the P.P.P.

The British Government handpicked a number of known stooges—men who the workers had rejected at the polls during the elections—to do its bidding. An interim Government was created. One of the first pieces of legislation passed by this group of lackeys was the subversive literature Bill banning the importation and sale of any Marxist literature—newspapers or any publication which attacked British and American imperialism and pointed the way to a better way of life under a socialist economic system.

The British and American imperialists feared a socialist Government in South America. During the life of the interim Government 1953–57 there existed a period of the restriction of the militant leaders of the national liberation movement. Books and literature were seized from the homes of known P.P.P. supporters.

The British Government injected large sums of money into the economy of the country. This was done with the hope of weaning support from the P.P.P. Some agricultural schemes were attempted with the hope of creating a middle class peasantry which would act as a buffer between the huge sugar companies and the sugar workers who form the largest section of Guiana's proletariat. A housing programme was also started, which temporarily alleviated unemployment among a small section of the urban workers.

These imperialist efforts failed to break the support for the P.P.P., but in 1955 the British and American ruling class were successful in splitting the Party. The People's National Congress (P.N.C.) was born. Mr. Forbes Burnham the present leader of this Party was, until the split, the chairman of the P.P.P. and was the Minister of Education in Dr. Jagan's first Government in 1953.

The Anglo-U.S. imperialists acted true to form. They successfully played off what they called the 'moderates' against the so-called 'extremists'. A section of the Guianese workers was then led by a group of middle class Afro-Guianese intellectuals.

The imperialists thereafter stepped up their work to establish a permanent division of the working class. They also encouraged the germination of an extreme right wing party. But this right wing party never really developed until after 1961. It is now led by a wealthy Roman Catholic businessman by the name of Peter D'Aguiar. It is important to note that the Roman Catholic Church is the real leader of this party.

Simultaneously with the development of this third party a consistent effort was made to co-ordinate the work of the religious organizations which had been carrying on anti-government activities since 1953.

And in recent months large sums of money have been continuously sent to B.G. with the object of organizing three new religious parties—one a Hindu, the other a Muslim Party, and a third is now being organized by Mr. Balwant Singh Rai who was a member of the P.P.P. and Minister of Home Affairs in Dr. Jagan's Government until he was expelled from the P.P.P.

The interim Government held office between 1953 and 1957 and came to an end when the British Government felt certain that they had successfully prepared the ground for the defeat of Dr. Jagan and the P.P.P. Prior to the holding of the 1957 General Elections the constituencies in the P.P.P. stronghold were gerrymandered. Dr. Jagan polled in his own constituency more votes than all the opposition candidates put together. But whereas the opposition secured five seats the P.P.P. only won one. This was a deliberate attempt to defeat the P.P.P. But the overall results of the 1957 elections showed a defeat for the opposition parties and imperialism, and victory for the Guianese working class—the P.P.P.

But imperialism will not accept defeat easily. Every trick and manoeuvre continued to be played against the progressive movement. The P.P.P. ran the country from 1957 to 1961. During this period the Government was unable to carry out any large scale economic development, though very many schools were built and agricultural schemes developed. Large amounts of lands were given to the landless peasants, and rural electrification began. However, the British and American Governments refused aid or large loans to British Guiana, because they did not want to strengthen the position of the P.P.P. and the Government.

By 1961, Dr. Jagan's Government had succeeded in its demand for a fully internal self-governing constitution, reluctantly conceded by the British Government. In the same year new General Elections were held, and again the P.P.P. was returned to power. The workers were convinced that the P.P.P. was working in their interests.

BLATANT INTERFERENCE

During the 1961 election campaign the most blatant interference in Guiana's internal affairs was perpetrated by the British and U.S. Governments. Large quantities of U.S. dollars were sent to the Opposition Parties—vehicles, electrical equipment, anti-communist literature were supplied to assist to defeat the P.P.P. The christian anti-communist crusade alone admitted spending seventy-six thousand U.S. dollars in support of the Opposition Parties.

It was an open secret that the C.I.A. and the British Intelligence Organizations collaborated with the Opposition with the hope of defeating

the P.P.P. Anti-communist films were nightly features all over British Guiana. The radio, and newspapers all came out in full force against the so-called 'red menace' which was supposed to be threatening the country and the entire continent.

Members of the McCarthyite organization of the U.S.A. visited the country, all with the hope of influencing the electorate. Two anti-communists, Dr. Schwartz and Dr. Sluis from the Anti-communist Crusade, visited the country on several occasions and spent a very long period organizing the Opposition.

Later, the U.S. Government, in conjunction with the British Government, and acting through the I.C.F.T.U., organized an economic blockade against British Guiana. All affiliates of the I.C.F.T.U. in other countries were instructed to assist in the blockade. This exercise was carried out in order to force the resignation of Dr. Jagan's Government. This occurred during 1961-62. That year saw the passing in both chambers of the legislature a demand for political independence. The British Government got out of fixing a date for independence by helping to instigate a so-called general strike. During this same period the Government was introducing a motion in the legislative Assembly which is known as the 'Labour Relations Bill'. This Bill intended to increase taxation; and thus raise some capital for much needed economic development. The British and American Governments in collaboration with the Opposition political Parties, encouraged the British Guiana Trades Union Congress to call a general strike to oppose the Bill and this was done with the sole objective of harrassing the Government. To some extent the imperialists succeeded. The strike lasted for eighty-three days.

Sections of the economy were badly affected. Some employers actually paid the workers their wages when they were on strike. Others lent their employees some money so that they could meet their domestic obligations. Also during this period the lumpen proletariat was encouraged to burn the business section of the capital, looted business places and attacked innocent supporters of the Government. Some Government supporters were murdered, some raped, and some badly injured.

After the crisis and chaos in the country, the British Government sent out a 'Commonwealth Commission' of three eminent jurists from Ghana, the U.K. and India. It is interesting to note a section of this commission's report:

The Trade Union movement and the Opposition parties were arraigned against the Government, each for reasons of their own. The United Force and the commercial people were actuated by personal motives rather than

ideological difference. The leaders of the P.N.C., the main opposition party, were actuated by the failure of their ambitions and realization that there was no future for them as Dr. Jagan's allies and supporters. Mr. L. F. S. Burnham the leader of the P.N.C. was himself spurred on by a desire to assert himself in public life and to establish a more important and more rewarding position for himself and bring about Dr. Jagan's downfall.

The British Government, having failed to find anything to discredit the Government of Dr. Jagan, sought new opportunities to defeat the P.P.P. When independence talks were again held in London during the autumn of 1963, the British Tories ignored the question of independence, and instead imposed the holding of new elections under a system of Proportional Representation (P.R.). This undemocratic step was taken regardless of the fact that under the British Guiana Constitution new elections were not yet due; and in spite of the protestations of the Government delegation. P.R. was demanded by the Opposition Parties, but it is a well known fact that this new electoral system was first asked for by one of the representatives of the sugar monopolies in British Guiana. The introduction of the new electoral system was the climax of an international imperialist conspiracy designed solely to defeat the P.P.P., and bring the Opposition to power.

The Government and the P.P.P. vigorously opposed this new tactic. Country-wide rallies and demonstrations were held in protest against this blatant interference in British Guiana's internal affairs. It is necessary to re-state that British Guiana is fully internally self-governing; and it was entirely unconstitutional for Mr. Duncan Sandys to take any steps concerning new elections or a different electoral system without the consent of the British Guiana Government. It is indeed a convention of the British Parliament dating from the middle of the nineteenth century, that their Government cannot and should not interfere with the constitution of a self-governing territory without the consent of the elected Government.

The same British Government refused to interfere with the constitution of Southern Rhodesia because it is said that Southern Rhodesia is internally self-governing. But it is quite clear that if the Government of a self-governing territory is working in the interest of the British capitalists—even though that Government is undemocratic and refuses to allow the majority of Africans their inalienable right to partake in the governing of their country, the British Conservative Government is prepared to support a small group of white extremists to suppress by force the majority of African workers.

This is a typical example of British capitalist hypocrisy.

But in British Guiana the political situation moves very rapidly. The past six months saw the longest general strike in the sugar industry in the history of British Guiana. The strike lasted 155 days.

The sugar workers are in revolt against a corrupt union—the Manpower Citizens' Association (M.P.C.A.). The workers are rejecting this union because it serves the employers and not the working people. Simultaneously the workers are demanding that the employers give recognition to the Guiana Agricultural Workers Union (G.A.W.U.) which is being led by P.P.P. Assemblyman Mr. Harrylall.

TERROR METHODS

This strike again was opposed by the imperialist forces, and their 'sabotage gangs' were used to murder and maim literally thousands of supporters of the Government. Terrorists threw bombs and hand grenades into the homes of Government supporters. Many others were shot going about their lawful business. Thousands of homes were completely burnt to the ground and some victims were shot by thugs when they were trying to leave the burning buildings. For example, in the mining town of Wismar, which is sixty-five miles from Georgetown and about forty miles from the nearest sugar estate, the Opposition parties organized their supporters to destroy by fire 1,500 houses of Government supporters, and 2,000 workers from this district had to flee to Georgetown to save their lives. Women and children were raped during this episode, beaten and murdered. The police and the British troops who were armed stood by and watched genocide being committed against these innocent people and did not intervene to assist them.

British Guiana was faced with its first refugee problem.

The P.P.P. and the Government have had and are still having the problem of trying to rehabilitate these victims. On the other hand, when the Government supporters try to protect their lives and their families, and defend their homes, the police and the British troops use brutal measures against them. Flogging and modern methods of torture are not uncommon. The State machinery is carrying out its role true to form. The judiciary is extremely hostile to the Government. And a situation is now reached where supporters of the Government often do not seek redress in the Courts as they know only too well that the dice are loaded heavily against them.

The British Government, in its attempt to defeat the Government and to discredit the P.P.P., arrested and detained thirty-six members of the P.P.P. including the Deputy Premier, Mr. Brindley Benn, Minister of Agriculture, Forests and Lands, and Leader of the Legislative Assembly. At the time of his arrest he was also acting Minister of Home Affairs. In all, five P.P.P. Legislators were detained. This in effect

removed the majority that Dr. Jagan's Government had in the House of Assembly. Mr. Harrylall President of the progressive G.A.W.U., who is also a Legislator, and his General Secretary, Mrs. Philomena Sahoye, were also among the detainees.

What the imperialists could not have done by way of the ballot, they did by force. Since the supporters of the Government have been detained, the Opposition 'terror campaign' developed tremendously. Freedom House, the Headquarters of the P.P.P., was bombed and a section of the building was destroyed; one member of the Party died during this explosion and several were injured. Also a firm supporting the Government was bombed almost simultaneously with the Party Headquarters, when again one member died and several were injured. These explosions took place at the same time that the Premier had called a meeting of the two Opposition leaders, Mr. Forbes Burnham and Mr. Peter D'Aguiar in order to find a formula to end the crisis in the country. These two particular bomb attacks demonstrated that the Anglo-U.S. imperialists do not want a democratic settlement of the problems of British Guiana. They so far have profited by confusion and chaos. The exploitation of our minerals continued unabated.

The imperialists and their local agents—the P.N.C. and the U.F., have to some extent succeeded in encouraging Afro-Guianese to attack Indo-Guianese. These attacks have led to counter attacks and racialism has raised its ugly head to an alarming extent among the Guianese people. The British and U.S. ruling classes are playing their famous game of 'divide and rule'. But in spite of the development of racialism the Afro-Guianese supporters of the P.P.P. are still there and are growing. And many more Guianese are beginning to understand how imperialism works by creating divisions among the toiling masses.

With the hope of bringing the crisis in British Guiana to an end the leader of the P.P.P., Dr. Cheddi Jagan, put forward the following proposals to Mr. Burnham:

Council of Ministers: The P.P.P. and the P.N.C. to have an equal number of Ministries—five to each party—with the Leader of the P.P.P. being Premier, and the Leader of the P.N.C. being Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier shall be the Leader of the Legislative Assembly. The term of office of the coalition government is to be two, three or four years with a minimum period until August 1965, the life of the present Government.

It is my considered view that in the charged atmosphere of today a holding government for a short period until the proposed general elections later this year will not suffice to create the unity, peace and harmony which are so necessary today at all levels. It is my view that the coalition should continue after the next general elections on an agreed basis and that the Party Leader of the majority Party should be the Prime Minister and the other Leader, the Deputy Prime Minister.

On independence, the Ministry of Home Affairs should go to one Party with a Junior Minister to the other Party; the Foreign Affairs and Defence Ministry should go to the Party which does not hold the Home Affairs Ministry, and Junior Minister to the other Party.

Head of State: On Independence the Head of State should be mutually agreed upon by all Parties.

House of Assembly: The future House of Assembly is to be made up on the Surinam model of a combination of the first-past-the-post and proportional representation systems. I suggest the existing thirty-five constituencies to be the basis of new general elections at a time to be mutually agreed upon. In addition, there should be seventeen seats allocated to each party on the basis of the votes polled with the proviso that no party would share in the allocation of these seats unless it polled a minimum of 15 per cent of total, valid votes cast. This proviso is in keeping with your proposals to the Constitution Committee of 1959 for the prevention of fragmentation and the formation of a multiplicity of parties. It is also in keeping with our present electoral laws which cause a candidate to forfeit his deposit if he or she does not obtain 15 per cent of the total votes cast in the constituency.

Senate: I suggest that the Senate be reconstituted as follows:

Six P.P.P., four P.N.C., one U.F., and two others (Messrs. Tasker and Too-Chung).

United Nations Presence: Between now and Independence there should be a United Nations Presence in British Guiana. During this interim period all preparatory steps must be taken to create with the help of the United Nations and British Commonwealth territories, Security, Police and Defence Forces, and institutions in which there is public confidence.

Agreed Programme: The P.N.C. and the P.P.P. should immediately set to work to produce an agreed programme based on a domestic policy of democracy and socialism, and a foreign policy of non-alignment. A Central Committee and various sub-committees should be established to produce a detailed domestic programme within two months.

British Government: Immediate representation should be made to the British Government for the latter's agreement to electoral reform and other arrangements proposed above.

Mr. Burnham rejected these proposals. I believe that because the imperialists are determined to defeat Dr. Jagan's Government, Mr. Burnham has not been given much scope for manoeuvre by them, and thus he again cannot accept the proposals of Dr. Jagan. These proposals would have given Mr. Burnham's Party the P.N.C., a majority in the Senate, and half of the Ministeries with important veto powers over the cabinet.

Instead of accepting these proposals, the main Opposition Party intensified their terrorist campaign. This was clearly revealed when the Commissioner of Police for British Guiana, Mr. Peter Owen, made the following statement on August 17th 1964:

The Police of British Guiana have detained nine men following the discovery early last week in a Georgetown Guest House of an arms cache

which included large quantities of police ammunition, gelignite, and time-bomb devices.

Among the detainees are two former senior Police Officers, a Deputy Superintendent and an ex-Inspector. All the detainees are linked with the Opposition Party, the People's National Congress.

On September 1st, Mr. Peter Owen made a further statement in an affidavit to the Supreme Court, that the country's main Opposition Party, the P.N.C., had a terrorist gang responsible for a 'series of crimes such as murder, arson, causing explosions to buildings and subversive and criminal activities'.

Following this dramatic disclosure, five P.P.P. detainees, among them the Deputy Premier, Mr. B. H. Benn, and Mrs. Philomena Sahoye, General Secretary of the G.A.W.U., were released. But the majority of the P.P.P. prisoners were still held, in spite of this information which had come to the notice of the public.

THE WIDER CONTEXT

The political problems of British Guiana must be seen within the context of the entire South American continent. There is a dilemma facing imperialism in this region. British Guiana is situated on the mainland of South America, and the socialist intentions of Dr. Jagan's Government and Party are terrifying to the British and American Governments. Also the successful trading agreements that were made with the Cuban Government are angering particularly the American Government. The American Government has been able to get some of the reactionary, and some Fascist Governments of Latin American countries to cut off trading and in some cases diplomatic relations with Cuba. But all the U.S. administration pressures and blackmail failed to divert the Government of Dr. Jagan from its fraternal contacts with the Cuban Government and people.

Also the American imperialists are facing armed revolts in Venezuela led by the national liberation movement, and the Anglo-U.S. Governments fear that if independence is won by Dr. Jagan's Government this would mean a further blow to U.S. domination. They are also fearing that British Guiana could be a socialist spearhead on the mainland of South America. In Chile and other Latin American countries, the workers are in revolt, and the imperialists are worried about socialist internationalism from an independent Guiana. And their attitude is 'come-what-may' British Guiana must be prevented from gaining independence under Dr. Jagan in this strategic part of the Western Hemisphere.

In recent months the U.S. Government has become more emboldened since it successfully organized the overthrow of President

Goulart's Government of Brazil, and thus they are using all tactics, military and subversive, to defeat the P.P.P. Government. But in order to construct a facade for their criminal work the last British Government was preparing the conditions for a rigged general election this year in British Guiana. The date which the ex-Tory Government set for the elections was December 7th. But the holding of elections would not solve the problems of British Guiana. What is necessary is political independence with a P.P.P. Government in office.

At the present moment Guiana is in need of solidarity from all colonial and ex-colonial countries—in fact all peaceloving nations. The Guianese working class are determined to defeat imperialism and capitalism in spite of the overt and covert interference of the British and American Governments. The P.P.P. led by Dr. Jagan will establish socialism on the mainland of South America. But one fundamental question that is now the concern of the Guianese socialists is whether Anglo-U.S. imperialism will permit British Guiana's transition to socialism via parliament.

November, 1964

HOW VORSTER USES ANTI-COMMUNISM

Savitri Azad

DISLIKE OR FEAR of communism is a weapon in the hands of extreme reactionaries, and its potency in the South African scene needs to be examined and understood.

It is the contention of this article that anti-communism is used as a means of preventing unity among all progressive forces, and through disunity permitting the advance of reaction; that it is used as a means of paralysing activities and action on the part of those opposed to fascism; that it is the means used to silence all opponents of a reactionary regime, whether they are communists, non-communists, or even themselves opposed to the ideas of communism; and that it is the means of discrediting the actions of non-communists in South Africa, both within their own country and in the eyes of the world.

There are historical examples of this, the best-known being from Germany and America.

In Germany, the attack of the Nazis on all civil liberties and their subsequent destruction of all opposed to them began with a full-scale attack on the German communists. This was the prelude to the Nazis' rise to power, and the basis of their success.

It should never be forgotten that when the Nazis seized power their support among the German people had declined sharply; they were, in fact, already on their way out. And these were the methods they used to obtain power *against* popular support:

- * terrorism and thugs, armed, equipped and financed by big business and large-scale capitalists who were terrified of communism;
- * disunity and confusion among those opposed to Nazism;
- * the Reichstag Fire plot which was engineered by the Nazis both to frighten others, to discredit communists and as an excuse for their destruction.

In the German context, anti-communism prevented world unity in action to save the Jewish people. Communists outside Germany were

the only ones who, between the years 1933 and the end of the 'phoney' war, consistently tried to force the world to believe the truth about the concentration camps and the destruction of the Jews. It was anti-communism that prevented enormous numbers of people in England and other countries from believing the truth of what was happening.

This fear of communism, or lack of understanding, or blind anti-communism nearly brought world victory for the Nazis. Their triumphal parade through Europe was made possible by the anti-communism which produced the failure of Britain, Poland and other countries to unite with the main anti-Nazi force in Europe: the Russians. In the end, this disunity was only broken by the physical attack of the Germans on the U.S.S.R.

In America, the nightmare of the McCarthy era, now regarded with shame by the vast majority of Americans, was made possible only through anti-communism. McCarthy's extraordinary hold, the powerful position he built up for himself, enabling him to be responsible for the removal from public office, from the professions, the universities, even the films, radio and television, of people of progressive, liberalistic or even just humanist ideas, all this was only possible through anti-communism.

Anti-communism is the veil behind which an attack is made on all civil liberties. This is how it has worked in South Africa as well.

In 1948, only three years after the downfall of the Nazi-Fascist axis, the world was shocked by the victory in the General Election of the Nationalist and Afrikaner Parties coalition, headed by Dr. Malan, over the United Party led at that time by General Smuts. However lukewarmly (he refused at all times to arm African soldiers or institute democratic reforms which would have inspired the oppressed majority) Smuts had backed the United Nations in the war; Malan and his party had backed Hitler, and many of his lieutenants, men like Verwoerd and Vorster, were open admirers of fascism. Smuts and the United Party, never true friends of democracy, had already seriously weakened civil liberties in South Africa; the Nationalists set to work in earnest to destroy them altogether.

The assault on liberties in South Africa began in earnest in 1950 with the Suppression of Communism Act. This Act was not just a preliminary to further laws limiting liberties, it was also in itself an attack on both communists and all anti-Nationalist groups. This fact was recognized at the time by very wide groups including the Johannesburg Bar, which declared: 'The objects of communism as defined in the Act are very wide indeed. They include many liberal and humanitarian

objects which are advocated and cherished by persons who are very far from being communists. These provisions have no legal bounds . . . and are a complete negation of the liberty of the subject as guaranteed by the rule of law.'

The Institute of Race Relations, after emphasizing its absolute opposition to communism in all forms, stated: 'To promote the liberties of all groups within a society is the professed aim of communists. Hence to widen the definition of "communism" as the Act does to include any person who, at any time, has "encouraged the achievement of any of the objects of communism" gives the Government unfettered power to prevent activities upon which the progress of the Western democracies has been based.'

The African National Congress, South African Indian Congress and other organizations, including the Communist Party, recognizing the extreme dangers of the Act, joined in a campaign against the Act before it became law. The non-communist groups that participated in this campaign did not then, nor subsequently, allow themselves to be deceived by the cry of anti-communism and the unity with communists that was forged at that time was responsible for the strength and effectiveness of the national liberation front in subsequent years. But among Whites the cry of anti-communism was more potent, and weakened and disarmed opposition to the Nationalists.

The Suppression of Communism Act defines 'communism' very widely, to include not only 'the doctrine of Marxian socialism' but also any doctrine or scheme which aims at bringing about any political, industrial, social or economic change within South Africa by the promotion of disturbances or disorder, or by acts which aim at the encouragement of feelings of hostility between Black and White. It is also defined as including any doctrine or scheme aiming at bringing about any political, social or economic change in co-operation with any foreign government or institution, whose purpose or one of whose purposes is to promote any political, industrial, social or economic system similar to that in operation in any country which has a system as defined in the Act.

The Communist Party of South Africa was declared unlawful, and the Act empowers the Governor-General to declare any organization unlawful if he is satisfied it is furthering the achievement of *any* of the aims of communism. The Minister of Justice was directed to prepare a list of members of organizations declared unlawful. Persons so listed, plus those found guilty by the courts of contravening the terms of the Act ('statutory communists'), are then subject to certain bans and

restrictions. The Act also empowers the Minister to ban publications and gatherings if he considers these are likely to further the aims of communism (as defined in the Act).

Together with subsequent amendments (particularly those of 1962) the Act now gives the Minister of Justice power to take action against many categories of persons; for example: members or active supporters of any organization declared unlawful under the Act; persons listed as being members or active supporters of any organization deemed unlawful (this now includes the African National Congress, the Pan-African Congress, the Congress of Democrats, and other bodies deemed to be carrying on *any* of the activities of these organizations), and also 'statutory' communists; and persons deemed by the Minister to be promoting any of the aims of communism, or likely to do so, or engaging in activities which may do so.

One example here will illustrate the enormous range of the powers of suppression under the Act. A woman in Johannesburg who had no political affiliations, was not listed, and took no part in political activities, was called before the Chief Magistrate and warned by him to cease 'activities furthering the aims of communism' or if she did not desist, she would be subject to bans or house arrest. When she asked what she was doing to further the aims of communism, she was told that she must herself be aware of what she was doing. There was actually only one thing: she was helping in the delivery of food for political detainees in the jails. This was the activity 'furthering the aims' that she was now compelled to cease.

People who have been listed as former members of the Communist Party, or as former members of organizations such as the Congress of Democrats which was legal until proscribed under the Act, and those who have been listed as 'furthering the aims', then become subject to a wide range of restrictions.

These include: being banned from gatherings; from being in any specified area during any specified period; restrictions on movements; house arrest; prohibition from performing any specified act; communication with other listed or banned people; restrictions on receiving any visitors; being compelled to report to the police at any time specified; being compelled to notify the police of any change of job or residence; prohibitions from joining other organizations; becoming subject to bans on recording, reproducing, publishing, printing or disseminating any speech, utterance, writing, statement or extract, made at any time; being prevented from associating in any way with publishing or printing.

Finally, it must be mentioned that the 'Sabotage' Act of 1963, with its fantastic powers, consists largely of amendments to the Suppression of Communism Act.

HOW THE ACT WAS USED

The immediate effect of the Act when it was first passed was to force the resignation from trade unions of a large number of leading, experienced trade union workers (about seventy-five), of all racial groups. Among them were people who had literally built the trade union movement in South Africa; many of whom were formerly members of the Communist Party, but included were people such as E. S. (Solly) Sachs, who had been expelled from the Communist Party twenty years before and had not been a member since.

A list of about 500 named people was prepared.

Messrs. Kahn and Carnesson, now listed communists, were ordered to cease to sit as members of Parliament and the Cape Provincial Council respectively.

The newspaper *The Guardian* was banned. (It reappeared under a new name—several times.)

Within the next few years, a foretaste of the powers of the Act was given. Hundreds of homes were raided by the police under the Act. Bans were issued against many A.N.C. leaders, including Chief Lutuli (in 1959).

But the first attacks under the Act were on listed communists. The government did not launch a full-scale attack immediately on all those opposed to apartheid. They were feeling their way, only beginning to extend their power, and were at the stage when they still had to break down organized resistance. A full-scale attack on Congress and liberals would have produced a strong, united resistance. The removal of communists from public activity was the essential first step to all that followed, and cleared the way for action against other groups. The communists were the most militant and active members of their trade unions and other organizations, and the most determined opponents of the Nationalist Party. Their warning that anti-communism was being used as a preliminary to the destruction of all civil liberties was not fully comprehended, and anti-communism among non-Nationalists prevented them from taking action to protect communists. The communists' warning: 'It is us now; later it will be everyone else' was not really believed by those infected with fear of being labelled a friend or associate of communists.

After the suppression of the Communist Party and the removal of

former communists from the trade unions, it became necessary to widen the net. This was logical, foreseeable, obvious, as long as any organized opposition to apartheid remained. The Nationalists had only two ways open to them: to permit legal opposition and allow freedom of assembly and association; or to suppress it utterly. The first choice was not possible while the vast majority of the population—practically every non-white and at that time a majority of the Whites as well—were deeply opposed to their policies.

If the names could be examined it would be found today that the majority of those now subject to severe restrictions and bans under the Act are non-communists.

By 1963 hundreds had been restricted, subject to various bans, forced to resign from jobs, prevented from entering factories or schools, silenced, confined and in other ways regulated under the Act. These included twenty-four who received house arrest orders, confining them to their homes for twelve or twenty-four hours a day; more than a hundred confined to specified districts or areas, such as townships, or kraals, or to within a mile or less of their homes; large numbers prohibited from entering factories (this was used to incapacitate the trade union movement), or mine premises, or the premises of dozens of specified organizations, or to belong to any organization which in any way discussed any policy of the State (this includes professional organizations and may compel a person to cease practising his profession); others had to relinquish their jobs as journalists; were made to report weekly or daily to the police; were forbidden to communicate with anyone at all, other than immediate members of their family; were forbidden to give lectures or enter educational institutions. The Act lent itself to tailoring to fit individual cases. Thus, for example, a courageous and outspoken member of the Liberal Party in Pretoria, Mrs. Adelaide Hain, had been in the habit of attending court and listening to prosecutions, so that she could obtain legal or financial aid for the accused where necessary. Her bans (which prevented her from being present at her own child's birthday party and attending school sports) also prohibited her from entering any court of law; an effective way of silencing someone who was troublesome in exposing injustice.

The significance of the Act emerges when it is realized that although the decimation and destruction of anti-Nationalist forces has been conducted under this Act, to date *nobody has yet been convicted* under the main definition or even under three of the four sections of the Act; the only convictions to date have been under section (b), the section

dealing with those aiming to bring about a change by promotion or disturbance or unlawful acts, and was used notably during the Defiance Campaign of 1952. The main definitions have not been employed in prosecutions, and the present trial of Fischer and others is the first to take place in the fourteen years of the Act.

Once having silenced communists, then Congressites and others; having banned newspapers and magazines; brought an end to public meetings and campaigns and public protest to apartheid policies; the cry of 'anti-communism' is now extended to cover not only liberals and other progressive groups, but in fact as the basis to attack all who do not subscribe to apartheid, to destroy the moderating influence of some Churches and further, as the basis to attack scientific thought and to plunge South Africa into the sub-twilight of medieval thought. Anti-communism has become the shield for anti-semitism and for attacks on internationalism. And the final logic: any nation of the Western world that disapproves of the racial policies of South Africa is accused of playing the game of the communists.

ANTI-JEW AND ANTI-CHURCH

The three loudest voices speaking in the name of anti-communism are the Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd, the Minister of Justice, Mr. B. J. Vorster, and the new voice that daily pronounces throughout the land, that of the brother of the Minister of Justice; he is Dr. J. D. Vorster, an actuary of the Dutch Reformed Church.

Anti-communism has made all suspect, and all the enemy. The technique is exactly that of Goebbels and Hitler.

'The damage done by the British Churches cannot be undone . . . (they) have declared political war on South Africa', declared Dr. Verwoerd after the British Council of Churches had condemned apartheid. He slated Archbishop Joost de Blank and the former British Ambassador Sir John Maud, describing them both as enemies of South Africa. In another speech he issued a strong warning against 'social religion' which is 'driving out godliness and replacing it with lesser human feelings'. He claimed that an international organization was undermining South Africa's culture, an organization consisting of 'internationalists' who claimed great knowledge and to be deep thinkers. They aimed at one culture of Black, White and Yellow and would try to penetrate schools, universities, newspapers and churches and use these mediums to destroy the Republic's culture. 'We must be prepared to fight on every level against internationalism.' He told the Methodist Church he 'despises their hypocrisy' and accused them of 'prejudiced political attacks on South Africa'.

'Among other people who spread the communist creed in South Africa', stated the same learned Doctor, 'are liberals and reactionaries who are sufficiently misguided to believe that they were fighting for freedom and democracy'. These fellow-travellers were as great a danger, if not greater, than the communists themselves.

'It was clear that the Jingoese, the Liberalists and the Communists lay in the same trench to shoot at the Government' (B. J. Vorster).

'Pseudo-liberalism is crushing the face of the earth . . . the cry of equality destroys all other freedoms. Anything can be sacrificed to the god of equality. Liberalism is a murderer of nations.' (Dr. Verwoerd.)

'Liberals prove of inestimable value to Communists. Liberalism does the demolition work. . . . Liberal circles thus constitute the main recruiting field of the Communists for their fronts. Liberal Christians, liberal Jews and liberal-minded universities have, down the years, rendered the greatest assistance to the Communists and have furnished the largest number of the fifth column.' (Dr. J. D. Vorster.)

'Part of the Communist onslaught on the West was through the churches, and devoted Communists were being trained as ministers and priests.' (Dr. J. D. Vorster in a speech mainly devoted to an analysis of Karl Marx, 'father of Communism, and a person of Jewish origins from an orthodox Jewish family.')

'Never before in our history have we been faced with such a threat as of late by our enemies inspired by international Communism.' (Dr. Verwoerd.)

'Schoolchildren should be taught the dangers of liberalism in the same way as they had classes on road safety . . . as a threat to what is pure and just.' (Afrikaanse Studentebond Congress.)

That liberalism paves the way to communism is the logical development of the anti-communist campaign, and the next step is just as logical: the accusation that liberalism is itself fundamentally unchristian.

The Jews are warned to behave themselves. Dr. J. D. Vorster issues warnings of the unpleasant consequences if Jews do not make the response he expects of them in his attacks on communism. The issue in South Africa, he said, is 'Where does the Jewish community stand against communism? That is the basic issue'.

Antikom is the journal issued by the Inter-Church Commission of the Dutch Reformed Churches, and the articles it publishes are identical or similar to those used by the Nazis, by Mosley, Father Coughlin in

the U.S.A. and others to whip up anti-Jewish feeling. Recent issues contain articles designed to prove that Jews were behind the Russian Revolution and the spread of the world communist movement.

It alleges that Lenin's parents were Jews, and his real name was Haim Goldmann. 'Bolshevism is organized and directed by Jews', and so on. Another article states that liberalism is a denial of a fundamental Christian concept that the authority for any government comes from God, not from the people; it opens the door to Communism because of 'broadmindedness and tolerance for the views of others'.

A *Volkskongres* to alert the Afrikaner volk to the dangers of communism began with a full-scale attack on the World Council of Churches and ended with a unanimous resolution asking the government to take positive action against the 'liberalistic press'. The resolution equated communism with liberalism. The leading speaker, editor of *Die Vaderland* (a newspaper owned by Verwoerd's company, A. M. van Schoor), said 'Fundamental to the re-assertion of democracy as a world force is knowledge, not this airy-fairy, hazy-crazy idealism and humanitarianism which is befogging Western thinking'.

Forward from liberalism to attacks on the Progressive Party, the all-White group that does not even want universal franchise in South Africa. The Progressive Party is contesting two Coloured seats in the forthcoming provincial elections. Dr. Verwoerd has warned them twice that Whites must not be involved in non-White politics. 'The Progressive Party continues to defy the Prime Minister's warning', says the *Rand Daily Mail*, 'and it is feared that it will be outlawed by legislation in next year's parliamentary session'. (This would incidentally make possible the removal of the lone Progressive member of parliament, the courageous Mrs. Helen Suzman, sole remaining voice of reason and protest left in the House of Assembly.)

Forward from liberalism and the Progressive Party to undermine all rational and scientific thought in the name of the struggle against communism. Blasphemy trials, heresy trials, exhibits on the evolution of man removed from museums because they offend the D.R.C.—this is like something from the middle ages. And now 'The South African Association for the Promotion of Christian Science' has been formed by D.R.C. theologians and professors from the universities of Potchefstroom, Pretoria and Bloemfontein, a move to influence the whole approach to scientific thought in South Africa. This brings neo-Calvinist Christian National ideology for the first time officially and through an organized body into the sphere of science.

'Our chief object is to ensure that the Christian attitude is maintained in science', states Professor J. A. L. Taljaard, secretary of the

association. The Christian approach could give science a new face. 'For those who believe in evolution, all the consequences must be faced . . . liberalism, socialism and communism—with the underlying philosophy of humanism—must also be seen for what they are.' He further said the Christian approach must be applied to every branch of science, including those such as cultural science, economics, mathematics, biology and agriculture. Professor Stoker of Potchefstroom University stated 'The truths of scripture are relevant to science . . . the aim of science was not to gain scientific knowledge for power to serve human interests, but to honour and glorify God'.

As with science, so with the arts. At the Afrikaanse Studentebond Congress Mr. Hans Swanepoel of Pretoria University said authors' 'freedom should be restricted' if they ignored their responsibility and preached liberal dogma harmful to the character and ideals of the volk. He spoke of a well-known Afrikaans author as being prepared to 'send little liberal monsters into the world and sit back to watch how they spread corruption and demoralization among the Afrikaner people'. He warned against liberal influences in cultural life, and even against 'liberal music' forced on the volk from outside.

These are not the ravings of the 'lunatic fringe'. These are the policies of the rulers of South Africa. This is the logical end-result of anti-communism: the denial of science, the denigration of art and culture, the vilification of humanism, the outlawing of all liberal thought, of ideas that widen horizons and enrich life; the fitting of a nation into a straitjacket—fascism. It is the final proof, if any is needed, that fascism and communism stand at opposite poles of man's thinking. Far from equating them, as so many non-communists of the Western world are fond of doing, the first condition of a successful fight against fascism is to defend the rights of communists.

For it is not sufficient for those non-communists who believe in the rights of man simply to assert their 'non-communism'. They must actively join *against* the anti-communist witch-hunt, or in turn themselves be hunted.

The African National Congress has been smeared because its leaders have for years been prepared to co-operate with communists, and because they have refused to be side-tracked into anti-communist witch-hunts, and have maintained as their clear objective the fight for human rights. Outside South Africa, the breakaway Pan-Africanist Congress won acceptance from certain circles, in spite of its narrow black nationalism, because of its avowed anti-communism. Certain groups were prepared to back and help build P.A.C. simply on this basis, and could as readily ignore the stronger claims of the A.N.C. for assistance on the grounds that it was *not* anti-communist.

The A.N.C. is not, and never has been, a communist-dominated or communist orientated organization, and a careful examination of the Freedom Charter, its stated programme, said by some to be 'communist' will reveal this. The Freedom Charter does not even accept the necessity for socialism. It calls only for the nationalization of mines and land as basic to the development of South Africa. Unlike Britain, which does not claim to be a socialist country, simply a 'welfare' state, the Charter does not even propose the nationalization of such public enterprises as transport. In the context of Africa today, with scarcely any country's leading men who do not accept the necessity for some form of socialism, the Charter is indeed a very moderate statement of aims. Only as a stick to beat the A.N.C. has it been labelled 'communist', an example of the destructive dishonesty of anti-communism.

Non-communists, unless they themselves are fascists, must defend the *rights of communists*, for this is the first line of attack on themselves. It is too often accepted that undesirable action may be countenanced if it is against communists. Then it only becomes necessary for the Minister of Justice to say that certain people were, or are, communists, to silence the sense of outrage at his actions. The house arrest of Helen Joseph, the first person to be so confined, aroused such a storm of protest in South Africa precisely because she was known as a non-communist. But had she been a communist, would such cruel restrictions upon her life then have become permissible in the name of the fight against communism?

No. Non-communists must now face this fact: when any government has powers to restrict and terrorize communists, the definition of what constitutes communism will continuously widen to embrace all those who are opposed to the despotic authority in power.

To follow anti-communism to its logical conclusion is to sink completely into the black pit of fascism—as South Africa is doing today.

ALL OVER AFRICA

Notes on Current Events

NIGER The Political Bureau of the Sawaba Party has called upon the people of Niger '... to take up arms in order to destroy the anti-national and anti-democratic regime imposed upon them by foreign forces'. It calls for the whole population to rally behind the country's Democratic Front, and for all revolutionary movements in Africa to give fraternal aid to the revolutionary forces in Niger. In its resolution, the party declares that in 1958 the French army of occupation set up a 'reactionary coalition in foreign pay in place of the legal Sawaba government'; that as a result legal administrative organs such as municipalities have been arbitrarily dissolved, all political parties and trade unions have been banned, all civil rights and personal liberties have been abolished, and '... for nearly six years the people of Niger have been submitting and continue to submit to all forms of repression' including imprisonment, confiscation of property, torture and political assassination. It declares that, in these conditions, armed uprising is '... not only their inalienable right but the sacred duty of all patriots worthy of the name'.

*

*

*

LESOTHO In the course of a well-considered resolution on problems of the international communist movement, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lesotho states: 'Our country lies in the zone that the Chinese comrades have described as the focus of the contradictions in our time. It is a small country surrounded on all sides by the Republic of South Africa with its notorious policy of racialism and apartheid. The country is under the rule of the British imperialists. The main economic activity of our people is to work on the farms, mines and industries of South Africa. Our workers migrate to work in South Africa on contract and return home on completion of their contracts. As far as land relations are concerned, they are prefeudal. The land by law belongs to the Basotho nation and is held

in trust for the nation by the ruler Mosheshoe II. There is no individual ownership. The interest of the British imperialists who have vast interests in the Republic of South Africa has been to ensure the efficient flow of labour to that country. Inside Basutoland itself no serious economic development took place. There is not a single factory in Basutoland. Agriculture is at a subsistence level. The governmental system is simple, and the apparatus of coercion is insignificant. We have no national bourgeoisie.

‘In these conditions the Communist Party of Lesotho believes it is possible to unite the workers, peasants and intelligentsia under the leadership of the working class party into a revolutionary force capable of carrying out revolutionary changes by peaceful means. Provided there is a guarantee against imperialist counter revolution, the internal enemies have not got the means to suppress the revolutionary people.

‘And what would the process of development be after the working class took power in such a country as ours? Taking over a country with communal tribal land relations inhabited by workers with experience of working on the mines, industries and farms of neighbouring South Africa, the first task would be to lay the foundations for a modern economy and to introduce agrarian reform. Such an economy to begin with could hardly be called a socialist economy nor would it be capitalist. It would be more correct to refer to it as a non-capitalist economy. The state form would be a national democracy—an independent national democracy. Then we would move to socialism and finally communism.’

*

*

*

RHODESIA The Smith minority government is intensifying its regime of repression against the people. With over 2,000 political activists in concentration camps, it has passed new measures including compulsory death sentences for those found in possession of bombs or grenades, and twenty years imprisonment for possession of ‘offensive weapons’. At the same time, special repressive powers are being given to the tribal chiefs who recently attended Mr. Smith’s secret ‘indaba’ at which the chiefs are said to have voted for independence of Rhodesia under the white dominated present constitution. Chiefs and headmen are being given firearms, and provided with special powers to deal with what the government terms ‘troublemakers’, including powers

of banishment. Government loudspeaker vans have been touring all African townships, threatening the opposition and stating that Africans will never again be allowed to form political parties.

In an attempt to bolster the Smith regime, Verwoerd's government has signed a trade treaty with Rhodesia which will give Rhodesian manufacturers easier access to South African markets, a form of economic subsidy to help Smith's regime survive the economic crisis. South African industrialists, particularly in the clothing trade, have always bitterly opposed any such step, because they fear competition on South African markets from Rhodesian factories paying lower wages. What *quid pro quo* Smith has given Verwoerd for this concession has not been revealed.

*

*

*

MALAWI Five ex-ministers of Dr. Banda's government—three summarily sacked by Dr. Banda and the others resigned in protest at the sackings—issued a slashing attack on Dr. Banda and his policy. 'Banda must be regarded as an enemy of Africa worse than Tshombe . . . a puppet of Portugal and her allies' they stated immediately after the sacking. The five, Messrs. Chiume, Chisiza, Chirwa, Chokani and Bwanausi allege that Dr. Banda has appointed a member of the Portuguese security forces to be Malawi consul in Mozambique; that he has increased his country's trade with South Africa in defiance of all-African calls for boycott; that he has ordered Malawians working in the Republic of South Africa to obey Verwoerd's laws; and that he is negotiating an exchange of territory with the Portuguese, to enable the Portuguese to form a buffer strip on its Northern frontier for use against Mozambique freedom fighters who have been reported in action in the area.

Dr. Banda has taken special emergency powers to detain without trial anyone whose detention is ' . . . reasonably required in the interests of defence, public safety or public order'. Another amendment to the constitution is designed to deprive the five ex-ministers and a sixth, Mr. H. Chipembere, of their seats in Parliament; it empowers the Prime Minister to dismiss from Parliament any M.P. who 'ceases to represent' the party for which he stood at the time of his election.

SUDAN Popular revolution, led by the National Front which unites all democratic forces in the country, has overthrown the military dictatorship headed by General Abboud, and set up a new National Front government. The military regime, which seized power by *coup d'état* in 1958, two years after the country's independence was proclaimed, survived an earlier popular insurrection in November 1959 through bloody repression, during which the leaders of political parties and trade unions were arrested and deported and their organizations outlawed. The National Front has grown in illegality. The general discontent of the population against the regime of repression has grown immeasurably during the past year due to the sharply deteriorating economic conditions and prices which have risen by as much as 30 per cent.

The National Front government has undertaken to restore democratic liberties at home, and follow a consistently anti-imperialist policy abroad. First fruits of this policy have been seen in the freeing of all political detainees, the restoration of political rights to political parties (including the Communist Party, which is represented in the Government), and the rendering of considerable aid to the anti-Tshombe forces in the Congo. A start has been made towards restoring the unity of the southern population with the northern—mainly Arab—a unity which General Abboud's policy of repression in the south shattered. The new government has promised elections before March, and a new constitution to be placed before the people for discussion and adoption. Under strong pressure from members of the armed forces who sided with the peoples' uprising, all the members of the Armed Forces Supreme Council which headed the military dictatorship, have been arrested, and a democratic purge of the army's ranks is imminent.

* * *

THE OPPENHEIMER EMPIRE South Africa's sprawling industrial and financial giant, Anglo-American Corporation, already well entrenched in South Africa, Rhodesia, Zambia (copper), Tanzania (diamonds) and elsewhere has announced a new, large scale venture in Mozambique—a £1 million first investment in a fish canning and freezing industry at Porta Amelia. Anglo-American will be the main shareholder with Portuguese interests and South Africa's fisheries' monopolists, Irvin and Johnson, in what will eventually be a £15 million investment, to be known as Industries de Peixe

Nostra Senhora de Fatima, which will employ eventually 800 whites and 10,000 Africans. The technicians will be mainly South African and Rhodesian. Managing Director Oppenheimer said recently that his company would like to expand its stake in Tanzania; it was prospecting for gold, copper or nickel but had not yet found anything worth while.

Another growing South African mining-financial concern, Federale Mynbou, with good political connections with the Verwoerd government and close economic ties in many joint ventures with Anglo-American, is reportedly negotiating a take-over of the Portuguese oil company, Petrofina, which produces oil in Angola. The negotiations are said by South African reporters to be conducted through the Portuguese Government, and to include a Federale Mynbou application for an oil prospecting concession in Southern Angola. Angolan oil, widely seen in South Africa as the means to break any future U.N. oil sanctions against the country, would be shipped to Walvis Bay—another good reason for Verwoerd's determination to cling to South-West Africa.

*

*

*

ZAMBIA The British South Africa (Chartered) Company, raised its revenue from Zambian copper by over half in the year ended September 1964, to a figure of over £15 million after paying 20 per cent of its net mineral revenue to the government. The Company's claim to continuing royalties for every ton of copper mined in Zambia—a claim which the Zambian independence movement has always opposed as bare-faced robbery—has been ended by the payment to the Company of £4 million, half paid by Zambia and half by the British government.

*

*

*

KENYA Immediately after presiding over Kenya's independence day ceremonies on December 13th, President Jomo Kenyatta opened the Patrice Lumumba Institute at Kamiti, seven miles from Nairobi. The school, dedicated to the memory of Lumumba, '... for his firm championship of genuine political and economic independence and socialism in Africa', will train one hundred and eight students at a time as cadres of the party. Journalists, civil servants and promising party members will be trained in the K.A.N.U. party spirit in theory and practice of African socialism. The school was paid for by donations from Afro-Asian and socialist states.

NIGERIA The General Election at the end of December was effectively boycotted in many regions by the main opposition parties headed by the National Convention of Nigerian Citizens (N.C.N.C.) because of the reign of terror during the election period maintained by the ruling Northern People's Congress. Over 16,000 opponents of the government were arrested, and troops opened fire on demonstrators. Widespread dissatisfaction exists with the Abubaker Balewa government, which has allowed Nigeria to become a prey of neo-colonialism, hindered African unity and even backed Tshombe. The elections were a farce, the boycott being complete in very many regions. A number of court cases are pending to unseat candidates 'elected' in these conditions. Nevertheless, influenced by Dr. Azikwe, a strong upholder of Nigerian unity who fears tendencies to balkanization under the weak Federal constitution imposed by British imperialism, the N.C.N.C. has decided to give the Federal Government 'a fair trial'. The Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party, based on Marxist principles, is gaining strength as a unifying, progressive, anti-feudal and anti-tribalist force.

*

*

*

ANGOLA The O.A.U. 'Committee of Nine' (Committee for the Liberation of Africa) has decided to recognize the People's Movement for Liberation of Angola (M.P.L.A.) and to give it technical and material aid. Previously the Committee had recognized only Roberto Holden's 'Provisional Government' (G.R.A.E.) which is backed by the Congo (Leopoldville) Government. The Cairo O.A.U. Conference last July appointed a special committee for reconciliation between the different liberation movements in Angola, particularly between M.P.L.A. and G.R.A.E., but Holden refused to appear before this Committee. The Committee heard a report from M.P.L.A. representatives, as a result of which it decided to go to Brazzaville and even visited one of the military bases near the Cabinda frontier. As a result it was convinced of the military and organizational strength, the sincerity and patriotism, of the M.P.L.A. It decided 'the M.P.L.A. is a serious movement, active and capable of leading an effective struggle'. Therefore it will receive aid and assistance, but the Committee of Nine will continue to make efforts at conciliation between the two movements.

Two Professors Fail to Explain

THE ECONOMICS OF APARTHEID

J. J. JABULANI

THERE HAS LONG been a need for an integrated study of the economics of apartheid. Here we have a highly developed industrial economy which has grown up in conditions where the labour force is sharply divided between a 'colonial' section, deliberately restricted in educational and employment opportunities and the right to collective bargaining, and a privileged white section which has a monopoly of these rights and opportunities. The distortions of traditional capitalist development imposed by these special conditions; the role of foreign investment; the relationship between mining and secondary industry; the agricultural background; the connection between the colour bar and capitalism; the current trend towards state monopoly capitalism and war economy; these and a very large number of related problems are a fascinating field of study which could add a great deal to our understanding not only of South Africa but also of the process of capitalist development in general.

Two recent studies by leading South African economists, Professor W. H. Hutt of Cape Town University and Professor D. Hobart Houghton of Rhodes University, fall short of meeting these needs. Both the professors are opponents of apartheid in theory and principle. But both of them are prevented by their own limitations of outlook and preconception from coming truly to grips with their subject, and of making a truly profound assessment of the material available to them. Hutt is a devotee of the 'classical' *laissez faire* school of economics which lingers on in certain academic backwoods but has long had to be thrown completely overboard by every capitalist state. Houghton is an admirer of the fashionable American school which strives to present an intellectually respectable alternative to Marxism by conceding certain Marxist positions. Both books serve to expose the

superficiality of bourgeois economics and its inability to provide a satisfactory analysis of the significant South African situation or any other contemporary phenomenon.

Despite the promising title of his book, Professor Hutt has merely succeeded in producing a compound of nineteenth century bourgeois economics, an equally primitive political philosophy, and a number of unbelievably crude 'sociological observations' such as the following gem:

Lightly coloured persons take every possible opportunity of passing for white, and although there is a big economic advantage for them if they succeed, that is by no means the whole reason for their wishing to do so. The standards of beauty among non-whites appear to have been subtly moulded by the prestige which attaches to a white skin and white features.

The lack of discipline in the organization of the book makes it very difficult to review. Nevertheless in all the morass one thing remains constant—the apologist for capitalism, living in a dream world where the level of wages is 'determined by supply and demand' (he actually writes this—about South Africa, the land of pass laws, reserves and forced labour!) and the benevolent character of the capitalist jungle, or as he puts it, 'the relatively benevolent operation of the free market'.

Incredible as it may seem, Hutt manages to find examples of 'relative benevolence' even in the savage pressures imposed to force Africans to work on the mines. He denies that the mine workers are exploited.

The cheapness of African labour did not . . . imply its exploitation. . . . It was the rise in the Africans' money wages above the value of those ('primitive') wants that could be satisfied by money expenditure, to which we can trace—in part—the origins of their high demand for leisure (the long periods devoted to living on previous earnings, in the reserves).

It is not because Hutt does not know of the poverty of the Reserves that he writes of a 'high demand for leisure'. The purpose of this mumbo-jumbo is to defend the brutal exploitation of African workers in the mines.

The South African gold mines were developed in a manner classical to the early stages of imperialism. Massive capital export for raw material exploitation, was accompanied by the necessary measures for creating a colonial administration to safeguard the investments. The use of cheap labour becomes essential for the maintenance of the high profits necessary if the metropolitan bourgeoisie is to be able to siphon off its excess capital.

Professor Hutt exposes his bankruptcy even further when trying to explain the fundamental origin of the imperialist exploitation of the African working class. (As far as he is concerned, this exploitation arose

out of the stand taken by the white section of the working class. The 1907 strike on the Rand mines 'prepared the way for colour bar legislation'.) Keen as the mine-owners were to use as much cheap labour as possible, they wanted to replace the skilled white workers, paid at higher rates, with Chinese workers who would do the same work at lower rates. The white workers stood firm on the demand 'equal pay for equal work'. Though even among the most developed sections of the Transvaal Miners' Association—the miners' union—equivocal attitudes were taken concerning the question of the exploitation of the African working class in the mines, the T.M.A. staunchly defended the gains of the white working class.

That the white workers were justified does not interest Professor Hutt very much. He hates trade unions anyway and even more, socialism and the organizations of the revolutionary working class. The trade unions emerge as a 'private coercive power' restricting capital in its benevolent mission. Professor Hutt's opposition to apartheid is much less than his hatred for socialism and Communists. He even describes apartheid as 'indeed the survival of a kind of socialism'.

This leading theorist of bourgeois economics has discovered that

Since they first came to the towns, the Africans have been able to satisfy their demand for traditional food, clothes and shelter by the expenditure of a relatively small proportion of their current earnings.

This, despite by innumerable findings (including those of a team of field-workers in Professor Hutt's own Department of Economics at the University of Cape Town) that African workers' wages were well below the 'poverty datum line'—the very minimum essential to provide a family with the barest needs of food, clothes and shelter. Instead of these hard findings, we are told by Hutt that Africans were 'happy, smiling, patient, submissive, respectful and courteous in their dealings with whites'.

Such outrageous and absurd statements are substituted for any serious attempt to analyse the dialectics of manufacture and production in conditions of apartheid.

The present political and social superstructure of white colonialism in South Africa has been determined very largely by the predominant mining industry, developed essentially on the familiar lines of colonial exploitation—mass alienation of the indigenous population from the land and forced-labour methods. The contradictions of colonial exploitation of raw material are in some measure different from those of capitalist manufacture. But by the time large-scale mining began capitalist manufacture had already been established, already formed

and confirmed in the legal, political and other institutions of the country, and giving rise to the basic contradiction of capitalist accumulation outstripping the growth of purchasing power.

The massive foreign investment in gold mining for a long time concealed this contradiction. The means of production grew to the dictates of the mining industry and were mainly of a capital-construction nature. To a great extent South African capitalist agriculture and manufacture depended on a foreign market.

But with the steady growth of the economy the need has become more and more acute for a stable and expanding home market, for the purposes of the accumulation and utilization of manufacturing capital.

A bigger internal market would however mean higher wages for the non-white working class and higher production costs that would scale down the profit rates and the predatory wages of the white working class. So long as the local market and the export markets were adequate for the development of the means of production, the bourgeoisie and its spokesmen lauded apartheid. Out of the system the bourgeoisie was earning its profits, bribing the white working class and still keeping prices down to what the local and export markets could bear. The development of the means of production is however beginning to meet the resistance of the social relations that arose in response to the imperialist exploitation of the country's raw materials and the cheap labour policy so useful for capital accumulation in the other sectors of the economy.

This is a contradiction that neither the bourgeoisie nor the state can solve. (The government has reacted to this situation by increasing immigration of white workers from Europe, hoping that by this means it can ward off the inevitable crisis of idle capital, falling profit rates and unemployment. Following the Nazi pattern, capital is being diverted to arms production and other unproductive ventures. State control is being intensified, to add to the considerable control the state already has.)

Hutt senses the conflict but he cannot get out of the situation. Characteristically he is happy just to point out the 'disadvantages' of apartheid. He is however incapable of understanding the interactions and the contradictions of the present South African situation.

He fails for instance to understand that there are sharp contradictions within the South African bourgeoisie. It is clear that a section of the capitalist class is concerned about the control that the government has over a significant part of the stock of capital. The consistent advance towards Nazism means that the property of part of the capi-

talist class will fall to the inevitable 'nationalization acts' of the government. Part of the South African bourgeoisie is acting in collusion, as in Nazi Germany, with the state; this section will obviously reap rich benefits from the expropriation of other capitalists who are a hindrance to the success of a war-based fascist economy. (Earlier this year Anglo-American took over the Afrikaner nationalist mining house, Federale Mynbou. The government immediately issued a statement deploring the take-over. Oppenheimer replied that one of the great problems of the country was the antagonism between the Afrikaans- and English-speaking sections of the population. He hoped that by the take-over he would contribute to better understanding between these two 'ethnic groups' in so far as they would all be working together.) In this case the sharp conflict between that part of the bourgeoisie which Oppenheimer represents and the government was dramatically exposed. The main section of the bourgeoisie won; yet this same section is worried about what the next twelve months or more of Nationalist rule will mean to it.

Hutt, the spokesman for 'liberal' capitalism does not understand the reality and significance of this conflict; he does not even see the significance of the decision to impose state control over capital investment in the 'Bantustans'. He sees as the 'cruel dilemma' of the 'true South African liberals' that

they must support action, even drastic action, to counteract a form of subversive activity which exploits violence. . . . But when the defenders of intellectual and economic freedom approve of the only procedures which many believe can be effective to suppress subversion, they seem to be defending the very policies which have played into the hands of the would-be saboteurs.

We must suppose that, if it would be possible to put it into plain English, this turgid prose means that having approved of Vorster's 90-day no trial law, Nazi police torture methods and other 'drastic action' against revolutionaries, the 'true South African liberals' like Professor Hutt feel aggrieved. Despite these degrading services to fascism they are nevertheless accused of encouraging the revolutionaries; they 'seem to be defending' radical policies themselves. A 'cruel dilemma' he calls it—well, perhaps it is. For years he has made a profession of 'seeming to defend' a sort of fantastic Adam Smith 'liberalism', while in practice giving unreserved support to capitalism and imperialism. Today, in the rough reality of the clash between open Nazi reaction and revolution in Africa, the imaginary 'middle ground' which people like these 'true liberals' 'seemed to be defending' has disappeared under their feet. What are his pious assurances about opposing apartheid worth—when in practice he supports

Vorster's gestapo against the revolutionaries who are the only force which can defeat apartheid? To Hutt, the national liberation movement sweeping through Africa is 'the ominous development of pan-African imperialism'. Faced with a real threat to white domination and vested interests, the 'true liberal' turns out to be a supporter of perhaps the most illiberal regime in the world.

Like Hutt, Professor Hobart Houghton is no Marxist. But his views on South African problems tend to be far more contemporary, intelligent and realistic—and, one should add, far more cogently expressed. He adopts the method of analysis expounded by the American economic historian W. W. Rostow in his book *The Stages of Economic Growth—A Non-Communist Manifesto*. As may be deduced from the title, Rostow attempts to provide an alternative to the Marxist method of historical materialist analysis. He concedes the correctness of Marx's emphasis on the development of the means of production, but eclectically isolates this element and rejects the Marxian analysis as a coherent whole. For this reason, Rostow's method is lacking in depth; it fails to encompass the crucial problem of changing social relations as they affect, and are affected by, the development of the means of production.

Relying on this erroneous approach, Houghton's book is unable to supply the reader with a profound analysis of the economy, or of the class contradictions in our country. In short, it is far from being a Marxist thesis. Nevertheless, unlike Hutt, he does provide the serious student with a great deal of factual material, concerning wages, foreign trade, farming, the value of economic output in the reserves, the development of state capitalism and similar important subjects. From these facts, the student can draw his own conclusions.

The great utility and interest of this book lies in its historical and contemporary presentation of the facts of the economics of apartheid. It emerges as an invaluable reference work.

The books reviewed:

The Economics of Apartheid by W. H. Hutt. Andre Deutsch Ltd., 1964. 182 pages, 5s.

The South African Economy by D. H. Houghton. Oxford University Press, 1964. 245 pages, 30s.

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

A Marxist commentary on political events with an international reputation over 41 years in the cause of national liberation and socialism.

2s. monthly — 10/6 half-yearly

DEPT. AC., 134 BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3. ENGLAND

Leading Journal of Marxist Thought and Opinion in the U.S.

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Organ of the Communist Party, USA

Authoritative articles and editorials on American foreign policy and the cold war, economic conditions in the U.S., the continuing struggle for Negro equality, nuclear testing and the armaments race, trade unions and the working class, culture and the ideological struggle, NATO and the Common Market, and other key political developments.

Annual subscription \$5.00

(Additional for Foreign Postage \$1.00)

NEW ERA BOOK AND SUB AGENCY
832 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y., U.S.A.

Peace, Freedom and Socialism

English edition of
PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM
(published in Prague)

Published Monthly *Price: One Shilling and threepence*

Write for a free sample copy to the distributors:

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.
37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1, England

Marxism Today

Theoretical and Discussion Journal of
the Communist Party of Great Britain

Monthly 2s.

Subscription rates: 6 issues 13s. 6d.; 12 issues 27s.

Order from:

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD., 37 GRAYS INN ROAD
LONDON, W.C.1

THE ROAD TO SOUTH AFRICAN FREEDOM

*The Programme of the South African
Communist Party*

What apartheid is—how to end it—what comes afterwards—
Communism and Africa.

PAPERBACK EDITION • 1s. 6d. post free

LIBRARY EDITION Cloth Cover • 8s. 0d. post free

SANCTIONS AGAINST APARTHEID

An authoritative analysis by P. Tlale

24-page pamphlet: 3d. each post free or 2s. 6d. per dozen post free

★ SPECIAL PACKAGE OFFER

**ONE COPY OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN ROAD
TO FREEDOM**

plus

**ONE YEAR'S SUBSCRIPTION (FOUR ISSUES) TO
THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST**

Send 7s. only

5s. in Africa

**Order from ELLIS BOWLES
52 PALMERSTON ROAD
LONDON, S.W.14
ENGLAND**

SOME ESSENTIAL FEATURES OF NKRUMAISM

(Compiled from articles in the Ghanaian newspaper, *The Spark*)
“... Here is the quintessence of Nkrumah’s ideas and policies”—*Africa and the World*.

2s. 6d.

THE INTERNATIONALE

R. Palme Dutt

“It is hoped,” the author writes, “. . . that this survey may prove helpful to readers newly interested in communism, to increase their awareness of the record and achievement of a century of the international communist movement.”

36s.

CAPITALISM YESTERDAY AND TODAY

Maurice Dobb

By a world-famous Marxist economist.

3s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION TO MARXISM

Emile Burns

A first outline of unrivalled popularity.

5s.

46
Bedford Row

LAWRENCE & WISHART

London, W.C.1

Printed by
Farleigh Press Ltd.
(T.U. all depts.)
Watford
Herts

HERE ARE THE ANSWERS TO

APARTHEID

what it is and how to defeat it

COMMUNISM AND THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

The Marxist-Leninist approach

THE FORCES OF CHANGE

NATIONAL DEMOCRACY



THE ROAD TO SOUTH AFRICAN FREEDOM

The Programme of the South African
Communist Party

PAPERBACK EDITION: 1s. 6d. post free
LIBRARY EDITION (Cloth Cover) 8s. 0d.
post free

SPECIAL PACKAGE OFFER:

One copy *The Road to South African Freedom*
plus One Year's subscription to
The African Communist
7s. only (5s. in Africa)

Order from **ELLIS BOWLES 52 Palmerston Road London SW14 England**